

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

✓✓



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

OFFICE OF
THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY
NO. 346 CONVENT AVENUE, NEW YORK

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

THOMAS F. MEEHAN, STEPHEN FARRELLY

REV. JOSEPH F. DELANY, D. D.

Editing Committee

VOLUME XII

JUNE, 1918

NEW YORK
THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

1918



E
184
C345
v. 12

Copyright 1918
by
**THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY**

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Church in the Island of San Domingo.....	7
<i>By Peter Condon, A. M.</i>	
Francis Cooper: New York's First Catholic Legislator....	29
<i>By William H. Bennett</i>	
Catholics in the War with Mexico.....	39
<i>By Thomas F. Meehan</i>	
Destruction of the Charlestown Convent.....	66
<i>Statement by the Leader of the Mob</i>	
Alaska in 1779.....	76
<i>Translation by the Rev. Walter F. Thornton, S. J.</i>	
Pierre Toussaint, a Catholic Uncle Tom.....	90
<i>By Henry Binsse</i>	
The Church of Saint Vincent De Paul (The French Church) New York	102
<i>By Henry Binsse</i>	
Our Diplomatic Relations with the Holy See.....	115
The General Meeting	118
<i>Editor</i>	
Notes and Comments.....	126
<i>Editor</i>	
List of Members.....	141

CATHOLIC HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

THE CHURCH IN THE ISLAND OF SAN DOMINGO.

By PETER CONDON, A.M.

PART I.

Among the remarkable events entering into the history of the United States during the past century the great expansion of its territory stands out prominently. The original thirteen States, forming the Union, comprised an area of 892,135 square miles. Therafter, commencing with the Louisiana purchase in 1803, and continuing down to the recent (1917) purchase of the Danish Islands in the West Indies, the United States has been adding to its territory until the present time when the total area over which our sovereignty extends amounts to 3,743,448 square miles or more than four times the original area of the Union. By far the larger part of this added territory was acquired by peaceful cession and treaty, France, Spain and Russia being the largest contributors. The most of this territory lies adjacent to our original boundaries, some of it within the nearby waters of the Caribbean Sea. The furthermost limits of the great Alaskan tract, which lie within the Arctic Zone, are separated from Eastern Siberia by Behring's Strait, a waterway only thirty-six miles wide at its narrow point, while the Philippines lie within the continent of Asia and are more than 6,500 miles distant across the vast expanse of the Pacific from the nearest port of continental America. This new territory so widely distributed implies a great variety of climate and natural resources as well as a diversity in the races of people by whom the same is occupied, and every section carries with it its own political and religious history. Each has been the scene of Catholic missionary effort. In some places the Church had been established and religion flourished long before the American Republic was proclaimed;

in others, the history of religion, commencing at a later date, is the story of the lives and achievements of the humble missionaries whose zeal to extend the kingdom of Christ and whose heroic labors and sacrifices, particularly among the aborigines of the Northwest and in Alaska, make a glorious chapter in the history of the Catholic Church in America. Hence we may assert that with the expansion of our National domain the field of American Catholic history has been equally enlarged so that the history of religion in any of those added territories has become a subject which should interest all Catholic historical students.

While the sovereignty of the United States has thus been extended over lands which are now definitely subject to its laws and government, there are other smaller states with whom we maintain certain political relations, without however encroaching upon their sovereignty, and over whose policy the United States exerts an influence calculated to serve for the protection of the smaller state and in a general way for the common benefit of both. Thus by virtue of the Monroe Doctrine and in consequence of various treaties, we are interested in the welfare of the various South American States and are especially concerned to see to it that they are secured against foreign aggression.

But there is another form of political relationship which our country has lately assumed with the governments of two small states whose historic associations are of surpassing interest to American Catholics. We refer to the two small separate and independent republics established on the Island of San Domingo (sometimes called the Island of Haiti), and known, the one on the Eastern side as the Republic of San Domingo and the other, on the West, as the Republic of Haiti. The former comprises an area of 19,200 square miles and contained in 1917 about 710,000 inhabitants. The area of the latter is 10,200 square miles and contains about 2,000,000 inhabitants. The population of the Republic of San Domingo while originally Spanish is now of mixed Spanish, mulatto and Indian character, while that of Haiti,

originally French, is now composed almost wholly of negroes and mulattoes, so that that State is sometimes spoken of as the "Black Republic." For some years diplomatic relations have been, as they are still, maintained between these two States and the Government of the United States, and, until recently, each remained free to administer its own government without any participation in its affairs by any other power. The revolutions constantly occurring, however, in each of these republics, together with the resulting political disorders and the failure of all attempts to maintain a stable government, showed that neither of these States could hope to survive as a civilized community unless help came from without. Their finances were in such condition that national bankruptcy was impending and from time to time the warships of foreign governments appeared in their harbors, threatening to intervene and collect the debts owed to their citizens unless some settlement were made.

Manifestly a strong arm was needed to rescue these helpless States from the forces of anarchy which threatened their ruin; to put an end to revolutions and maintain order; to prevent the looting of the public treasuries, and to manage the finances of these countries so that their creditors should receive their just dues and all danger of foreign interference be removed. In view of all the existing conditions it was considered that our own Government was the only one to which this task should be confided and accordingly two separate Conventions with the United States were entered into, one by the Republic of San Domingo, proclaimed July 25, 1907; the other with Haiti, proclaimed May 3, 1916. Neither of these was made dependent upon the other, in fact the Convention with San Domingo had been in force for nearly nine years before the Haitian treaty was concluded, and while both were designed for the same general purpose, yet there were important differences between them which will be mentioned.

Under the Convention with the Dominican Republic the

President of the United States was authorized to appoint a General Receiver to collect all the customs duties accruing at the several custom houses of the Dominican Republic (practically its entire national revenue), and to apply the same to the payment or retirement of its bonds according to a plan set forth in the Convention, such receivership to continue until all such debts are paid, with a stipulation that in the meantime no new public debt shall be contracted without the consent of the United States.

The treaty with the republic of Haiti, of more comprehensive character, provides for the appointment by that Government, upon the nomination of the President of the United States, of a General Receiver with authority to collect all the customs duties on both imports and exports accruing at the several Custom Houses and ports in Haiti, and for the appointment of a Financial Adviser, to be nominated by our President, whose duty it is to ascertain the validity of the debts claimed from Haiti and to report to both Governments what debts are finally established; to adjust its revenues and expenses and generally to devise and apply such improved methods in the administration of the financial affairs of Haiti as will best promote its welfare and prosperity. Toward these ends the Haitian Government is to co-operate by suitable legislation, and both Governments are to extend all the aid and protection which may be necessary for their accomplishment. Haiti likewise stipulates not to increase its public debt except by previous agreement with the President of the United States and not to contract any debt whatever in excess of its available revenues, nor to modify the customs duties or other revenues of the republic.

Another and very important feature is the provision for the establishment of a constabulary to be composed of native Haitians but to be officered by Americans nominated by the President of the United States. This constabulary is to have the supervision and control of arms and ammunition, military supplies and traffic therein throughout the country and is to be

supported by the full power of the Haitian Government in the discharge of these functions. All of this in aid of the preservation of domestic peace and order.

There is a further stipulation by the Haitian Government that it will not surrender jurisdiction over any of its territory to any foreign government or power by sale, lease or otherwise and will not enter into any treaty or contract tending to impair the independence of Haiti. By virtue of these conventions the entire public revenues of the two States have been placed under the control of the United States as trustee, as it were, for the purpose of discharging by annual payments the just obligations of each of the States and of turning the balance into their respective treasuries. But that trusteeship carries with it the right and duty of our Government to protect its trust, by force of arms if necessary, against all aggression or attempted interference, whether of local or foreign origin, and to maintain peace and tranquility so that the citizens of each of the States may be enabled to administer their domestic affairs in their own way to their best advantage, at the same time that their foreign debt is being gradually extinguished.

The history of the many revolutions which have occurred both in Haiti and in San Domingo shows that in nearly every instance the possession of the Custom House and its revenues has been the objective point of the revolutionists. Now that these revenues have been put beyond their reach and under the protection of the Government of the United States the motive for revolution is gone, while in Haiti where the political disorders have been most frequent the maintenance of a permanent military police, under the direction of United States officers, and backed when necessary by the military and naval resources of our Government, assures that republic against any attempt by the lawless element to overthrow the lawfully established government.

The prompt suppression of the few insignificant outbreaks

which have occurred have served to demonstrate that the business of revolution with its attendant pillage and plundering is no longer to be tolerated. Like results have been obtained in the Dominican Republic where, not long ago, the local authorities found themselves unable to cope with an incipient rebellion which threatened to interrupt the work in which the United States officials were engaged. By request of the Government a detachment of United States Marines was landed, who soon restored order.

That the arrangements thus entered into by the two republics have already proved to be of great benefit there cannot be any doubt; the just claims of foreign creditors are being paid as stipulated, debts which were shown to be usurious have been scaled down to their just amount and the national revenues have been increased so that, especially in San Domingo, a considerable surplus of money has been turned into the public treasury and made available for such improvements in its domestic affairs as the Government may see fit to undertake.

One other feature of these Conventions remains to be noticed. We refer to the stipulation in the treaty with Haiti by which that government agrees that it will not surrender jurisdiction over any of its territory to any foreign government and will make no engagement which might impair its independence. Only those who, like the officials of our Government, have kept a watchful eye on the conduct of affairs in the Island of Haiti can tell of the revolutions occurring there fomented by foreign emissaries and sustained by funds supplied from the same source (afterwards inserted in the budget as an item of the national debt), of the frequent calls made there by foreign warships and of the peremptory demands presented under threat of bombardment, for payment of claims which the distracted republics were unable to meet. From time to time the Haitian Government was notified by the representatives of foreign powers that their custom houses would be taken over and their territory occupied until the claims

were paid and, had the United States been willing, there is no doubt that long ago a protectorate or some other form of financial control would have been established over the whole island to be exercised by one or more European powers for the benefit of foreign bondholders. While the immediate purpose of these hostile demonstrations was to obtain payment of money claims, yet beyond this there was undoubtedly a design of obtaining a foothold on the island capable of being fortified and ultimately of being developed into a military post of great strategic value. The magnificent harbor known as Mole St. Nicholas, situate on the northwest coast of Haiti, is distant only forty nautical miles from Cuba from which it is separated by the Windward Passage. Over this historic route passes the great bulk of the commerce from South and Central America and it is the most convenient outlet to and from the Atlantic for the shipping passing through the Panama Canal. Three centuries ago it was the cruising ground for the Morgans, the Drakes and other less noted buccaneers and many a Spanish caravel freighted with valuable cargo fell a victim of their piratical exploits.

That at least one European nation unfriendly to the United States has designed to acquire this harbor as a naval station has been well known at Washington. Its possession by any foreign power would have been a menace to the commerce of the United States and would have imperilled the safety of the Panama Canal as well as of the other islands in the Caribbean Sea, in which we have an interest, and there can be no doubt of the wisdom of our Government in excluding hostile interference by entering into the friendly arrangements with the two republics as above described.

By the provisions of the treaty our Government has acquired rights in harmony with those claimed by it under the Monroe Doctrine. These guarantee to Haiti the retention of the whole of its territory undisturbed by any change of government which may be attempted either by paid revolutionists or by any corrupt bargaining by a *de facto* government with a foreign power. Be-

fore closing this brief sketch of the present relations between the United States and the two republics referred to it may be of interest to mention an episode in our history occurring nearly, fifty years ago which brought the Island of San Domingo and its people prominently before the American public and which nearly resulted in our incorporating that island permanently within the American Union.

Some of our older readers will doubtless recall the excitement which in 1870 prevailed in this country over the proposal to annex the island of San Domingo to the United States, and the bitter quarrel which ensued between the President and Charles Sumner, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, over the defeat of that project. At that time President Grant was serving his first term and Sumner, one of New England's foremost men, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, an office of large distinction and responsibility which Sumner had held for ten years and had filled to the satisfaction of his associates and of the country generally.

In San Domingo Baez, a new revolutionary leader, had acquired political control in the Spanish end of the island and throughout the various efforts to bring about annexation he was retained in power against rival leaders, only through the support given him by our navy under orders from the President. No sooner was Baez thus established as President of the Republic of San Domingo than certain land owners and concessionaires came to Washington and represented that the people of that Republic desired that their country should be annexed by the United States, and that Baez had authorized them to present the matter to our Government. They succeeded in interesting the President's military secretary (Babcock), and through him the President himself. Soon after, by direction of the President, Secretary Babcock visited the island, landing there from one of our ships of war in which he had made the voyage, and as the result of his activities he brought back a protocol or provisional treaty

providing for the annexation by the United States of the territory of the Republic. This was signed on behalf of the Republic of San Domingo by Baez and on the part of the United States by Babcock as "aide-de-camp to General U. S. Grant, President of the United States of America."*

While this remarkable effort at treaty-making was in progress several gunboats of our navy were moving up and down the coast of San Domingo whither they had been sent by direction of the President. They had been placed at the command of Babcock, by whom they were used to maintain Baez in power against the opposing revolutionists, who otherwise would have overthrown him as, in fact, they did soon after the support of our navy was withdrawn following the rejection of the treaty.

In definite form the treaty contemplated the acquisition of the whole island, including the Republic of Haiti, which had given no intimation of any desire of being annexed. In fact, when the Minister from that Republic at Washington, surprised at the reported surrender of his country's sovereignty, addressed Secretary of State Hamilton Fish asking an explanation of the matter, the Secretary declined to give any answer.

When Secretary Babcock returned with this treaty ready for submission to the Senate the President called upon Senator Sumner at his house and requested his support, for without a favorable report from the Committee on Foreign Relations its ratification by the Senate would be contrary to all precedent and could not reasonably be expected. Sumner found it impossible to support this treaty. He was opposed to the colonial expansion of our national territory, particularly in the tropics, and he favored allowing the colored race the fullest opportunity for self-government in Haiti. Indeed, it was through Sumner's efforts that the Haitian Republic in 1862 first obtained diplomatic recognition at Washington. But, apart from these considerations, the

* See "Memoirs of Charles Sumner," Vol. IV, pp. 426-445.

character of the principal advocates of annexation, their selfish interests which soon became known, and the methods adopted to secure the proposed treaty provoked opposition to their scheme. The treaty was denounced in the Senate as a project of intrigue and corruption, and as a land-grabbing speculation which had been manœuvred by a number of speculators and adventurers, and both the character of the President's secretary (Babcock), and his dealings with the various persons interested in the treaty, as well as the employment of the military and naval forces of this country in aid of that project, were severely criticised.

In the course of the investigation it was developed that the advocates of the treaty held grants of public lands, which had been obtained from one or other of the revolutionary leaders, including Baez, as well as various concessions for mining, for taking guano, and for the operation of railroads and steamship lines. Some of the most desirable land fronting on the harbor of Samana bay, admittedly one of the finest in the world, was held by men who had been most active at Washington in promoting the business of annexation. Here, as in other modern instances, the promoters were eager to have their so-called "vested interests" secured to them under the flag and, if necessary, by the military power of our Government.

Notwithstanding that great pressure was applied to induce Sumner and his associates on the committee to make a favorable report, he and they stood firm in their refusal and the treaty was rejected. The friends and partisans of the President spoke bitterly against Sumner and almost immediately the historian, John L. Motley, then our ambassador at London, and a personal friend of Sumner, was recalled from that post, an act which was generally regarded as the President's retaliation against Sumner. The annexationists, backed by the Administration, planned to have another vote on the question, and, in order that it should be a favorable one, openly announced their intention of having Sumner eliminated from the Committee on Foreign Relations,

which would be appointed at the new Congress to assemble in December, 1870. So bitter and vindictive was the spirit of partisan polities at that time that this plan was actually carried out and Sumner was subjected to the indignity of removal from a committee upon which he had served with distinction for so many years.

In his message to the new Congress the President, intent on bringing about annexation, recommended that Congress take early action for acquiring San Domingo and that a commission be appointed to visit the island and report as to its condition and circumstances with a view to the negotiating of a new treaty.

In deference to the President's suggestion Congress voted for such a commission, but cautiously added that this action should not be regarded as expressing any opinion favorable to annexation. Messrs. Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio, Andrew D. White of New York and Samuel G. Howe of Massachusetts were named as commissioners. These gentlemen, all friends and partisans of the President, returned to Washington in February, 1871, after a month's stay on the island, and made their report, in which they sought to justify the project of annexation. But the objections to it were so numerous and well founded and the advocacy of it so selfish and corrupt that the scheme was finally abandoned.

If our present political relations with these small sister States are of interest to us as American citizens it is safe to assert that their religious associations are not less interesting to us as American Catholics. Indeed it is only a commonplace to say that the history of San Domingo is identified with the very beginnings of Christianity on this continent. For it was on this island that the Cross was first set up, when the great Italian navigator landed there on December 6, 1492. Here, over 400 years ago, the first Mass was said; here the first monastic institutions were established, the convents of the Franciscans, the

Dominicans and other Orders following one another in quick succession. Here from a Dominican pulpit the indomitable Las Casas thundered out his denunciations of the oppression practised on his poor Indians practically enslaved by the Spaniards, and thus initiated the first anti-slavery contest known to history.

In the City of San Domingo the first Cathedral was built and has continued in use to this day, the oldest Christian temple of the Western Hemisphere. Here the Episcopal See of San Domingo was erected in 1513 and became an Archbishopsric in 1547, and thus entitled to the distinction of being the primatial See of all America, antedating the establishment of the hierarchy in the United States by more than two centuries and a half.*

During these four centuries and through all the political vicissitudes which have afflicted the island the See of San Domingo has been continued through a long line of Archbishops down to the present distinguished incumbent, the Most Reverend Carlos Nouel.

For the right understanding of the religious history of San Domingo it may not be amiss to mention at the outset that the Archbishops of that See never claimed to have, or exercised, jurisdiction over what has been called French San Domingo, being the territory now included in the Republic of Haiti. While the government of the Church in the Spanish portion of the island was administered by the Archbishop, assisted by subordinate officials, under the protection and with the assistance of the Spanish crown, the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in French San Domingo was wholly under French influence and was managed by the Superiors of Orders whose subjects were laboring there; by Vicars General and Prefects Apostolic, who

* In Shea-DeCourcy's "The Catholic Church of the United States" (p. 60) we are told that in July, 1784, when the question came up of the consecration of Rev. John Carroll as the first incumbent of the newly created See of Baltimore it was suggested to Benjamin Franklin, then our representative at Paris by the Pope's nuncio that Father Carroll go to San Domingo for his consecration unless he preferred going to France.

were commissioned by Rome generally at the instance of the French Court or of French bishops and by Papal delegates and legates, who made occasional visits. The hierarchy, however, was not established there until the year 1862, following upon a Concordat which was agreed upon between the Holy See and the Republic of Haiti in 1860, to which we shall refer later on.

If we seek an explanation of this singular diversity in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in the two political divisions of the island, both of which were under the direct control of Catholic sovereigns, we find that widely different circumstances attended the origin of Church government in the two places. When the See of San Domingo was established the Spanish colonists were the only representatives of any European nation occupying any portion of the island. Except for the ill-fated settlement which Columbus founded, where he made his first landing near the present Mole St. Nicholas, hardly any Spanish settlement was attempted in the western end. All trade and commerce was centered in the east. The ships which brought over colonists, missionaries, soldiers and officials arrived and departed from the ports on that side of the island. San Domingo itself, besides being the residence of the Archbishop, was also the official capital from which the administration of the business of the colony was directed, but outside of the territory inhabited by the Spanish settlers there were no ecclesiastical affairs to be administered. But the report of the discovery of a new continent had not been lost on the adventurers of other nationalities and within five years after the first voyage of Columbus French traders and sea-rovers and English buccaneers were sailing the Spanish main on the lookout for whatever prize might fall to their lot.

At first these freebooters made their rendezvous on the Island of St. Christopher (now known as St. Kitts), one of the lesser Antilles, the English at one end and the French at the other. But owing to dissensions between them the French were

compelled to leave, and they made a new settlement on the small island known as Tortuga, just off the northwest coast of Haiti. Colonists from France kept coming here and in time a considerable number of them crossed over to Haiti, where they established habitations and became sugar planters.

In France mercantile companies were formed and were licensed to trade with such islands in the West Indies as might be discovered or occupied by the subjects of that nation. There was the "Compagnie de St. Louis" and "Compagnie de St. Domingue," and more important than either of these was the association known as "des Seigneurs de la Compagnie des Iles d'Amerique," which enjoyed the favor of the powerful Cardinal Richelieu, who himself had a large financial interest in the enterprise. One of the conditions imposed on the association was that it would maintain two or three ecclesiastics in each settlement and provide churches and give such other support as might be necessary for the conversion of the savages to the Catholic faith. Accordingly, about the year 1626 some secular priests came over, and soon afterwards some French Capuchins and Dominicans arrived at Tortuga. At this time the French and the Spanish soldiers were contending for the mastery of that island and of the Haitian coast. Ultimately the French triumphed, and in 1697, by the treaty of Ryswick, all that territory in the actual possession of the French was formally ceded to France by Spain and thenceforward came to be known as French San Domingo. In the meantime a number of parishes had been established with the consent of the governors appointed by the French Minister of State, and these parishes were served, some by secular priests, others by members of the religious Orders who, at this period, were mostly Dominicans and Capuchins with a few Carmelites assisting. Later on the Capuchins withdrew and the Jesuits arrived. During these times the members of the religious Orders who constituted the larger part of the clergy were governed by a local superior with the

rank of Vice-Prefect, who was subject to a Superior General appointed for the French West Indian Islands and who resided at Martinique. This Superior General was then commissioned as Vicar General of the Holy See and Prefect Apostolic, deriving authority as such from the Propaganda in Rome and presumably entitled to exercise jurisdiction over seculars as well as the regular clergy.

But notwithstanding the extensive powers and jurisdiction conferred on them by the very source and fountain-head of all ecclesiastical authority these Superiors were not at liberty to act until they had obtained the approval of the Court at Versailles and the evidence of such authorization was required by the Supreme Council in the colony before they would be admitted to the exercise of their functions. It is needless, perhaps, to say that these ecclesiastical officials were wholly independent of the See of San Domingo as well as of all other episcopal authority.

At the commencement of the eighteenth century the whole of French San Domingo was divided into two Prefectures Apostolic, which were ruled by the Vice-Prefects above referred to, and the system which we have thus sketched continued as the only definite form of ecclesiastical government in Haiti down to the time of the Revolution in 1791, when the Church was ruined and religion all but extinguished. That government of the Church by Bishops was sadly needed during the times we have been describing there can be no doubt, nor that some efforts were made to procure their appointment, but owing to various causes to which at present we need not refer no Bishop was ever appointed until the rehabilitation of the Church under the Concordat of 1860.

From this summary account of the difference in the systems of ecclesiastical administration prevailing in the French and Spanish colonies respectively it will not surprise the reader to be told that the progress of religious affairs was attended by marked differences in the personnel of the ecclesiastics, in their

racial habits and characteristics, in the methods which they employed, the problems which had to be dealt with, the obstacles encountered and in the results which followed, so that just as each colony has had its own political history separate from the other, except for a brief interval in the nineteenth century, when they came under the control of a single political ruler, so each has its separate ecclesiastical history remarkable chiefly for its contrast with the other.

We have no intention of attempting to repeat any of the facts of general history relating to the colonization of the New World. The political, economic and, to a limited extent, the religious history of the Island of San Domingo and of the Spanish conquerors has been told in the writings of Irving, Prescott and Fiske among our American historians and in the fascinating pages of Sir Arthur Helps' "Spanish Conquest." But there are many topics of interest to Catholics which have not been dealt with adequately, or at all, by any of these writers.

While there is considerable Spanish literature relating to the colony in its early days, much of the material for its history in more recent times has disappeared with the loss of civil and ecclesiastical archives consequent upon the frequent changes of government or by their destruction occasioned by revolutions, fires and earthquakes, from which the island has often suffered. No doubt duplicates of many of these archives will be found among the official records at Seville, for the Spanish government was insistent that copies of all reports of proceedings and transactions occurring in the colony be sent to the Council at Seville. For the present, at least, these archives whatever may be their value are not available. A notable effort in aid of the ecclesiastical history of Spanish San Domingo down to modern times has been made by Very Rev. Canon (now Archbishop) Carlos Nouel, whose "Historia Eclesiastica de la Arquidiocesis de Santo Domingo Primada de America" contains much information relative to the See of San Domingo gathered from authentic sources

and not to be found in any work in English that we are acquainted with, and we beg to acknowledge our obligation to that work for various of the facts mentioned in these pages.

One of the questions in which students of American Catholic history have been interested relates to the identity of the first priest who set foot on the shores of the New World. It has been generally assumed that when Columbus left Palos on August 3, 1492, on his first and greatest voyage he was not accompanied by any priest, although he had at least ninety men on the three caravels under his command. We know, however, that on his second voyage when he reached Espaniola (the earliest name for the Island of San Domingo) in August, 1493, with his fleet of seventeen vessels carrying about 1,500 persons, one of these was Father Bernard Boyl, sometimes written Boil or Buil, who came over as Vicar Apostolic with full jurisdiction to administer ecclesiastical affairs in the new world. It is also known that this Father Boyl was a Benedictine monk, a Catalonian from the convent of Montserrat in Aragon, a man of learning and ability and one who enjoyed great favor at the Court of King Ferdinand. But it is asserted that the Benedictine Boyl was not the priest designated by the Pope, Alexander VI, in the Bull appointing a Vicar Apostolic, and that there was another Father Bernard Boyl, who was the Provincial of the Franciscans in Spain (see "Hist. Records and Studies," Vol. V, Part II, p. 284); that the Franciscan Boyl was the one who was actually appointed Vicar Apostolic and that, whether by error or design of the Court officials, it was the Benedictine who was notified that he had been appointed. Remarkable support of this view is supplied from the Text of the Bull which is addressed "Dilecto filio Bernardo Boil *fratri ordinis minorum*, Vicario dicti ordinis in Hispaniarum regnis, Salutem."* No Benedictine would have been addressed or described in a document of such character as belonging to the

* See the photographic fac-simile of this page of the Bull in Nouel's "Historia," etc., Tomo 1, p. 16.

Friars Minor, while on the other hand, this description of the person and religious status of the Vicar Apostolic was the appropriate title of the Franciscan Boyl. In 1851, when scholars were admitted to examine this Bull in the previously inaccessible archives of the Vatican, this phraseology was noted and has given rise to much discussion between the advocates and partisans of the two religious Orders interested in the question.

There are many reasons for saying that if Columbus were allowed any voice in the selection of the chief ecclesiastical official of the colony he would have preferred a Franciscan. The Franciscans had done him many acts of kindness and when he had almost given up hope of interesting the Spanish sovereigns in his undertaking it was Father Perez, his steadfast friend, the Guardian of the Franciscan Convent at La Rabida, who aided him in obtaining his much-sought-for meeting with Queen Isabella. It is well known that the Benedictine Boyl was not in sympathy with the disposition of Columbus favoring the mild and considerate treatment of the Indians and after a few months' stay in Espanola he returned dissatisfied to Spain and afterwards on various occasions showed that he was unfriendly to Columbus.

But whatever doubt there may be as to which Bernardo Boyl was the first lawful Vicar Apostolic there is also a doubt whether either of them was the first priest who journeyed from Spain to the new world. For, notwithstanding the confident assertions of some writers to the contrary, there is evidence to justify the claim that Columbus did have a priest with him on his first voyage, a Father Juan de Solorzano, who went as confessor to the great Navigator.

Although Canon Nouel does not accept this claim yet with great industry and impartiality, he has collected the proofs relating to it from the writings of various Spanish historians as well as from a Vatican Codex entitled "The Spiritual Conquests of the Order of Our Lady of Mercy" of which order Father Solorzano was a member. From a history of this Order prepared

by its own members and published in Paris in 1686 (see *Nouel "Historia,"* I, p. 10) we quote: "Columbus, being ready to start, applied to the Most Reverend Father General of the Order of Mercy asking earnestly that from among his religious he would give him a priest to be his confessor. In response the Father General gave him Father Solorzano, a religious of eminent piety, whose many voyages undertaken for the redemption of captives" [referring as we may understand to those held in Africa by the Moors], "had inured him to the hardship of ocean travel." The statement of this appointment of Father Solorzano to accompany Columbus and that he sailed with him on his first voyage is repeated in at least three other histories, all of earlier date, relating to the Order of Mercy, and a tablet in the cloister of the Convent of the Order at Xeres, also records the name of Solorzano as one of the company sailing with Columbus on his first voyage.

Historians are agreed that when Columbus sailed from Palos on August 3, 1492, his three caravels had on board not less than ninety persons. But Justin Winsor in his "Narrative and Critical History of America" says (Vol. II, p. 10): "There is a wide difference as reported by the early writers as to the number of men which Columbus had with him on this voyage. Ferdinand Columbus says ninety; Peter Martyr, one hundred and twenty; others say one hundred and eighty."

Prescott, in his "History of Ferdinand and Isabella" says (Vol. I, p. 477): "The total number of persons who embarked amounted to one hundred and twenty."

Assuming the number to be only ninety, John Fiske in his "Discovery of America" says (Vol. I, p. 420) that "eighty-seven names out of the ninety have been recovered." These are enumerated in Appendix C, Vol. II, p. 594, and this list is given on the authority of what the historian described as "the learned monograph *Colon y Pinzon, Informes,*

etc.," of Fernandez Duro, published at Madrid, in 1883. The name of Father Solorzano does not appear on this list and, saving only the possibility that his may be one of the three missing names, and assuming the list to be accurate and complete, we face another of those historical puzzles as to which there are contradictory opinions and which may be solved only after some industrious historian shall have delved through Spanish archives as yet unexplored.

In a review of Father L. A. Dutto's "Life of Las Casas" in the *Dolphin*, Vol. I, p. 242, the writer says: "Father Dutto is of opinion that no priest accompanied Columbus on his first voyage. The fact cannot be proved one way or the other from documents. Yet it would seem unlikely that the navigator, with his burning faith and zeal for religion, and supported as he was by the religious rather than the secular element in his first undertaking, should set out without a priest, unless we assume that there was no one willing to run the risk of accompanying him."

The hypothesis that no priest could be found to go with Columbus we consider to be highly improbable, in view of the spiritual purpose which characterized the undertaking and the great number of ecclesiastics who had taken an interest in it. No doubt our readers will wish that the claim made for Father Solorzano may be substantiated by convincing evidence. Despite the worldliness and self-seeking with which Columbus has been charged by some of his critics, fair-minded historians in general concede that he was animated by a sincere desire of winning to the Christian faith the uncivilized races whom he expected to discover. He knew the importance of religious ministrations to those who profess the true Faith. We are told that on the morning of the departure from Spain Columbus and his companions received Holy Communion in the chapel at Palos.*

He was starting on a voyage whose duration could not

* Helps, "The Spanish Conquest of America," Vol. I, p. 69.

be foretold. His vessels had been provisioned for a full year. There was actually a period of ten weeks from August 3 when he left Palos until October 14 when he landed on San Salvador and seven months almost to a day elapsed from the time of his departure until his return to Palos. And it is entirely consonant with the character of Columbus that he should have been solicitous for his own spiritual welfare and that of the men under him to have asked for and obtained a priest to go with him on his voyage.

It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that in our remarks relative to the first priest in America we have not overlooked the colonization of Greenland by the Northmen and their subsequent visits to Vinland in the tenth and eleventh centuries and the adventurous voyages of Leif Ericsson after the previous colonization of Greenland ("Historia Ecclesiastica" of Adam of Bremen assigned to year 1073). As the result of this settlement Greenland, during the era spoken of, had an ecclesiastical establishment which lasted about four hundred years or almost until the time of Columbus. One of the treasures of the Vatican archives is an original Bull dated February 13, 1206, entered in the Papal Registers of Pope Innocent III, in which mention is made of the "Grenelandiae episcopatus." (See a fac-simile reproduction in "The Vatican," p. 475, New York, 1914.)

Parishes were established and even some monasteries (see "Catholic Encyclopedia," article "Greenland," Vol. VI, p. 775). Fiske speaks (Vol. I, p. 221) of the "Cathedral Church of the Gardar Bishopric which was a suffragan first of Hamburg and later of Trondheim," and (p. 222) of the appointment by Pope Paschal II, who died in 1118, of Eric Gnupsson as "Bishop of Greenland and Vinland *in partibus infidelium*." After him came a succession of sixteen or more bishops down into the first half of the fifteenth century. The last Bishop whose name is mentioned was Endrede Andreasson. But by the time of Columbus this colony was completely extinguished. There was then no

Bishop or priest remaining in it, and none in any part of the Western Hemisphere except possibly in Iceland, whose last Bishop is recorded as having survived to the year 1550.*

But besides the Benedictine Boyl there were other priests who came over with Columbus on his second voyage. Franciscan and Dominican missionaries soon began arriving in the colony and found immediate employment in attending to the spiritual needs of both the Indians and their Spanish conquerors. Before long the religious conditions existing there were considered to be of such importance that the Spanish Court took steps for the establishment of the hierarchy. How this project progressed and was ultimately realized will be told in the next chapter.

* See also "History of America before Columbus" (Vol. II, p. 48, sq.) by Rev. P. De Roo, whose researches, including a personal examination of Vatican Archives, have enabled him to present much interesting historical information relative to the ecclesiastical establishment in Greenland during the period above referred to.

FRANCIS COOPER: NEW YORK'S FIRST CATHOLIC LEGISLATOR

By WILLIAM H. BENNETT

Among the pioneers of Catholic New York in the closing years of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries few were of more mark in his generation and less known today than Francis Cooper.

The family was of Teutonic origin and had settled in Northampton, now Allentown, Pennsylvania, prior to 1763. The late Dr. John Gilmary Shea says that Mass was first offered there by Father de Ritter, in the home of Francis Cooper, about 1769. In 1764 the subject of this sketch was born. The town records of Allentown, or Northampton, show the many changes the family name underwent until it was finally anglicized into Cooper. In 1764 Frantz Kuper was assessed £6. In 1765 Frantz Kupper was assessed for one house and one lot. In 1766 the name is spelled Frantz Cupper, occupation cooper, and in the following year, under the same name is assessed £4. In 1768 France Cooper's worldly goods had increased to one house, two lots, and a cow, on which he paid a tax of one shilling, five pence. In 1772 the name is entered Frantz Kooper and in 1773 Frantz Kuper.

The Indians having killed several whites six miles from Northampton, on October 10, 1763, Captain George Wolf mustered a company to defend the settlement. France Keffler was among the volunteers. Peter Rhoads, keeper of a general store in Northampton, in a diary now in possession of his great-great-grandson, Charles R. Roberts, President of the Lehigh County Historical Society, names Francis Cooper as a customer in 1774.

Francis Cooper, private of the sixth class, is inscribed on the

muster roll, June 18, 1777, of the First Battalion of Northampton County Militia, Colonel George Hubner, commanding, in Captain George Graff's company. Francis Cooper, the elder, was, therefore, one of the many Catholic soldiers of the revolutionary army.

Shortly after the evacuation of New York by the British, Francis Cooper, the younger, came to the city and had the great good fortune to form an intimate friendship with the "self-effaced philanthropist" Cornelius Heeney. Heeney was in the fur and pelt business in a building he owned at 82 Water Street and lived above the store. Cooper made his home with Mr. Heeney and the two were joined by John George Gottsberger, recently arrived from Austria. At this time Cooper was about twenty years of age, Heeney ten years older and Gottsberger a young man. All three seem to have had a keen sense of that humor that brightens companionship, and to have lived happily in their "bachelors' hall." On working days Heeney labored to build up his fur business and Cooper, having finished his apprenticeship, engaged in his trade of coppersmith, on Water Street. Many of their evenings and all their Sundays were devoted to the interests of St. Peter's Church. The trio served for many years as trustees of that cradle of New York Catholicism. On the old bell which is still under the roof of St. Peter's is the inscription:

“Rev. William O’Brien	Michael Roth
Rev. Matthew O’Brien	Francis Cooper
Thomas Stoughton	John Byrne
John Sullivan	Andrew Morris
Cornelius Heeney	Trustees.

Cosse, Founder Made at Nantes 30 January, 1806"
"The best of friends must part." Into the Eveless Eden of
Water Street, Eve cast her shadow and there was regret when
Francis Cooper announced that Anna Paul was about to become
Mrs. Cooper. The furniture and fittings had been bought in
common, Francis Gottsberger, a son of John George Gottsberger.

has told us, and an auction, restricted to three bidders, was arranged. Miss Paul visited the rooms and selected such articles as would help to equip the new home. At the sale, in a spirit of mischief, Heeney and Gottsberger bid up the furniture of the future Mrs. Cooper's choice and made their old companion pay dearly for his desertion.

In St. Peter's baptismal register appears the following entry: "October 4, 1793, John, son of Francis Cooper and Anna Paul. Godfather, Cornelius Heeney. Godmother, Harietta Read."

As a Democratic Republican, Francis Cooper was elected a member of the New York State Assembly for the twenty-ninth session, 1806. He was the first Catholic elected to the State legislature.

During the long debate on naturalization in the convention at Kingston, in March, 1777, to settle the frame of the new government for the infant State of New York, John Jay proposed an amendment to the 36th paragraph of the proposed Constitution which read: "And abjure and renounce all allegiance and subjection to all and every foreign king, prince, potentate and state, in all matters ecclesiastical and civil," which was passed on April 1.

In the Laws of New York revision of 1801, Chapter CXIII, "An Act Concerning Oaths," the following form of oath was adopted: "I do solemnly, without any mental reservation or equivocation whatsoever, swear and declare that I renounce and abjure all allegiance and subjection to all and every foreign king, prince, potentate and State, in all matters *ecclesiastical as well as civil*, and that I will bear faith and true allegiance to the State of New York, as a free and independent State." Francis Cooper, as a loyal and consistent Catholic, refused to take this oath and, according to the Journal of the Assembly, twenty-ninth session, 1806, he was absent from the opening session, Tuesday, January 28.

The congregation of St. Peter's at once addressed a petition

to the Legislature protesting against the exclusion of Catholics from the common rights of citizenship. The document was presented to the Senate by Mayor DeWitt Clinton. The *American Citizen*, a New York newspaper, commenting on the petition, February 4, said: "The petition from the Roman Catholics, respecting the oath of a member, which it is supposed *excludes* that religious sect from a seat in the Legislature, was presented to the Senate by the Mayor on Thursday last, and was referred to a committee of which that distinguished citizen was chairman. It is sincerely wished that relief may be granted. The convention certainly never intended to exclude any religious sect from the common rights of a citizen; . . . the subject is certainly worthy of the most serious consideration of the Legislature."

The bill revising the oath passed the Senate February 5, with but one dissenting voice. The Assembly assented February 10 by a vote of 63 to 26 and the *Citizen's Albany correspondent* says: "The bill, I presume, will meet with no opposition in the Council of Revision and Mr. Cooper will take his seat in the course of a week." The oath, as revised in 1806 and taken by Assemblyman Cooper, was as follows:

"I do solemnly, without any mental reservation or equivocation, swear and declare (or affirm as the case may require) that I renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty whatsoever and that I will bear faith and true allegiance to the State of New York as a free and independent State."

In this same Kingston convention the section of the Constitution in relation to religious toleration came up on March 20, 1777, and John Jay gave further evidence of the malevolent bigotry that has made his name forever odious to the Catholics of New York. The section in question declared "that the free toleration of religious profession and worship shall forever hereafter be allowed to all mankind," but Jay proposed this amendment:

"Except the professors of the religion of the Church of Rome,

who ought not to hold lands in or be admitted to participation of the civil rights enjoyed by the members of this State until such time as the said professors shall appear in the Supreme Court of this State and there most solemnly swear that they verily believe in their consciences that no Pope or priest, or foreign authority on earth, hath power to absolve the subjects of this State from their allegiance to the same. And further, that they renounce and believe to be false and wicked the dangerous and damnable doctrine that the Pope, or any earthly authority, hath power to absolve men from their sins, described in and prohibited by the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and particularly that no Pope, priest, or foreign authority on earth hath power to absolve them from the obligation of this oath."

After a long debate this motion was lost by a vote of 19 to 10. The section was finally adopted, on April 1, as amended to read: "Provided, that the liberty of conscience hereby granted shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of this State."—(*Journal of the Convention*, pp. 844-860.)

During this session a memorial and petition of the trustees of St. Peter's Church was presented asking for aid to support a charity school. This was referred to a special committee consisting of Mr. Cooper, Mr. Russell and Mr. Smith. In due course Mr. Cooper reported from the committee that "they have had the same under consideration, and are of opinion that the prayer of the petitioners is reasonable and ought to be granted; they have prepared a bill for that purpose, and directed their chairman to ask leave to bring in the same." Leave was accorded and the Act became law March 21, 1806. Mr. Cooper served with distinction in the Assembly, sessions of 1806-7-8-9-14 and 26.

In the list of subscribers to Pastorini's "History of the Church," published by Bernard Dornin in 1807, is the name "Francis Cooper, Esq."

The General Society of Mechanics and Tradesmen, one of the most powerful bodies in the State at that day, was instrumental in organizing and incorporating the Mechanics Bank, the fourth incorporated in New York, now known as the Mechanics and Metals National Bank. Its charter provided that seven of its directors must be chosen from the General Society of Mechanics and Tradesmen; that four must be of the mechanical profession, and that the Society's president was ex-officio a member of the Board. Among the organizers and directors was Francis Cooper, who had been a member of the General Society since 1792.

The bank opened for business in a three-story building, formerly the home of Alexander Hamilton, on Wall and Broad Streets, opposite the Federal building. The house stood a rod or more back from the street, and on the front lawn President Slidell, who occupied the floors above the bank, tethered his cow. A striking contrast to conditions in the present-day heart of the financial world.

In 1810 Francis Cooper, who had been paymaster of the Seventh, afterwards the First Regiment, of the Militia, resigned his commission.

The Roman Catholic Benevolent Society, which in 1836 became the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum Society, was incorporated in 1817. Mr. Cooper was deeply interested in the orphans. There are a number of references to his work among them, in his letters to his parents, in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Cooper moved from downtown to Bleecker Street, then in the suburbs. In 1817 an act incorporating the new St. Patrick's Cathedral in Mulberry Street was passed and Francis Cooper was one of the trustees. He was elected Assistant Alderman of the Eighth Ward, bounded by Canal, West, Hammersly and Houston Streets and Broadway, in 1821. His name is found among the subscribers to "The New Testament by Way of Question and Answer, etc." by his intimate friend, the Rev. Dr. John Power, published by James Cunningham in 1824.

The letters of Mr. Cooper to his parents throw many interesting sidelights on church affairs, trustee troubles, etc., in the twenties and thirties. Although he was evidently an advocate of the trustee system he possessed the friendship and confidence of Bishop Dubois. In a letter of August 16, 1827, to his parents, he wrote: "Perfectly agree with you that if they were to send out from Rome some proper person to examine all the dioceses in this country, but who is it that they would likely send, not a layman certainly, and others would likely pay all attention to what was said against trustees unless he was well acquainted with the world and remained some time in this country and liberal in his opinions and judge from his own observation, little could be expected, but we must wait."

He mentions in this letter a postponed sermon and concert for the benefit of the orphans in which Signorina Garcia was to take part and at which she and a committee of women of the congregation were to take up the collection. "This would be a novelty," he comments. In a later letter to his sisters Helen and Frances he wrote that Signorina Garcia proposed the fair collectors should have a male escort through the church aisles. He was apprehensive lest the Signorina select him for her escort. In which event he wondered if he "should not blush like a *blue blanket in a dark entry*."

In a letter of October 11, 1827, he tells his parents of the appointment of a pew rent collector for the Cathedral, "whom some of our Revd objected to so much and no doubt I shall be out of their good graces; however, the Bishop and me remain as usual and he appeared to be willing for the appointment and ample security is to be given." Turning to politics he wrote: "I heard Old Hickory did not do as well as was expected with you, but what else could we expect? Quakers are non-combatant and a soldier would not do for them; we will make up for it here and give them a double shot."

A perennial anti-Catholic bugaboo story has had it that the

Cathedral site at Fifth Avenue and Fiftieth Street was handed over to the Church authorities gratis by a corrupt band of politicians. As Francis Cooper was the purchaser the thrice told tale of its acquisition may bear repetition here.

The city authorities, in 1799, sold the plot to a private purchaser for £405, receiving an annual quit rent of four bushels of wheat. After passing through several owners, a mortgage on it, held by the Eagle Fire Insurance Company, was foreclosed in 1828, and at this sale it was bought by Francis Cooper, who, in the following year sold it to the trustees of St. Patrick's and St. Peter's Churches, for \$5,500, good market value at that time. In 1852, as the result of a friendly partition suit, St. Peter's half interest was bought by the Cathedral for \$59,500.

Mr. Cooper's solicitude for the orphans is expressed in a letter to his parents, September 26, 1829: "We have now about eighty children in the asylum and almost daily applicants for to admit more; unfortunately I am on the committee for admission and likewise to put out, which makes it truly unpleasant, to be under necessity to refuse admission, to tell them that our means are too small to take more; they cannot understand that my colleagues are so complaisant that I generally get the odium of not feeling for the poor children."

The Sisters of Charity opened a pay school for girls at 261 Mulberry Street in 1830. The circular announcing the opening bore the names of Very Rev. John Power, V. G. Dennis McCarthy, Francis Cooper and Cornelius Heeney.

During a heated political campaign in 1832-3 the *Catholic Miscellany*, edited by Bishop England, charged Martin Van Buren with "having refused Francis Cooper a seat in the Legislature of New York because he was a Catholic." The *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia carried the story in its issue of January 9, 1834. When Van Buren was nominated for the Presidency against General Harrison the old story was resurrected. Patrick Sharp of Philadelphia wrote Bishop England, in 1840, "to confer

a lasting favor on the Catholics of this district by giving your meaning of the subject." The Bishop replied promptly that "Van Buren is totally innocent of the charge."

Cornelius Heeney organized and incorporated the Brooklyn Benevolent Society, in 1845, and endowed it with the bulk of his fortune. He named among the incorporators the two friends of his early manhood, Francis Cooper and John George Gottsberger. Two years later Francis Cooper, then eighty-four years of age, saw the body of Heeney, his friend for nearly sixty years, placed in the vault that had been prepared for it in the rear of St. Paul's Church in Brooklyn.

Two years later, in 1850, the *New York Herald* announced his death: "On Wednesday, the 3rd of April, Francis Cooper, Esq., in the eighty-sixth year of his age. The friends of the family are respectfully invited to attend his funeral, from his late residence, No. 12 Amity Place, on Friday the 5th inst., at half past 3 o'clock precisely, without further invitation."

Following a similar death notice in the *Evening Post* is the obituary:

"The deceased has been a resident of this city for about sixty years last past. He commenced business as a coppersmith in Water Street, which he conducted with industry and success and accumulated a moderate fortune. Some years since he purchased a plot of ground once the country seat of Leonard Beecher, Esq., where he died. The deceased was for many successive years elected a member of the House of Assembly of this State. Very few of his early colleagues survive him. He was a man of great firmness of purpose and resolution, and of indomitable courage; of the Republican school in politics. He adhered to his principles to the close of his life. He has left no children, but his estimable widow survives him. Few men have died more generally known and more universally respected."

Mr. Cooper married twice. He made his will March 25, 1850, and it was witnessed by Cornelius Bogert of 126 Bleecker

Street, a friend for fifty-six years, and D. Banks of 121 Bleecker Street, a friend for forty years. Dr. Jeremiah Van Rensselaer was named executor. In it he disposed of realty on Thompson and Lawrence Streets and Amity Place, now West Third Street. His estate was divided among his widow, Maria B. Cooper, his second wife; the children of his deceased brother Conrad, who had lived in Philadelphia; the children of Fannie, his sister, and of Eliza Fest, a niece.

[The compiler gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the Right Rev. Mgr. James H. McGean; the Rev. Joseph A. Dunney, S. T. L., Albany, N. Y.; the Rev. Peter J. Fuengerlings, Bally, Pa.; Mr. Charles R. Roberts, President Lehigh Valley Historical Society; Miss Jane Campbell, the American Catholic Historical Society, Miss Theresa Slevin, Mr. O. J. Starr, and Mr. Dennis C. Fauss in preparing the foregoing sketch.]

CATHOLICS IN THE WAR WITH MEXICO

By THOMAS F. MEEHAN

On December 11, 1917, thirteen negro soldiers of the Regular Army were hanged by order of a court-martial at San Antonio, Texas, for mutiny. Following this event the Associated Press sent out from Washington a story which stated that no such wholesale execution had taken place since General Scott had executed the "St. Patrick's Battalion" who had deserted during the Mexican War. A number of papers commented on this story and although it was not explicitly stated the inference was widely propagated that a military organization in the American army called the "St. Patrick's Battalion" and made up of Catholic and Irish soldiers had deserted to the Mexicans because of religious affiliations. Later they were captured by General Scott and executed as deserters. This inferential slander on a section of the citizens of the Republic that did their patriotic part in the Mexican and all other wars in which the United States has been engaged has been circulated on several other occasions.

In the Library of Congress the sole reference to the "San Patricio Battalion," in the bibliography of the Mexican War, is that of an article in the *U. S. Cavalry Magazine* for September, 1913, which is published at the Staff College, Leavenworth, Kansas, for the Regular Army officers studying there. This article is written by one J. T. Hopkins, who, to further his anti-Catholic purpose, deliberately garbled a general order issued by General Scott. This order, up to the time of the Hopkins article, was among the unpublished data in the archives of the War Department at Washington. Its correct text and the garbled Hopkins version are quoted later in this paper.

Another attempt to disseminate this slander was made in the

American Freemason of October, 1916 (p. 587) where we read:

"I quote from the official report of Major General Casey of the United States Army, in the *Christian World*, Vol. XXIV, page 47:

"On the 20th of August the battles of Contreras and Churubusco were fought. At the latter place the principal point of attack was a fortified convent, and the American army lost 1,000 men in killed and wounded by the obstinate resistance. This was caused by the presence of more than two hundred deserters from the American army, composed mostly of Catholic Irish, *who had been persuaded to desert at the instigation of the Mexican Catholic priests*. Fifty of these men were afterwards captured and hung, the drop of the gallows falling just as the American flag went up on the castle of Chapultepec."

"Of the same incident Rev. William Butler says in his 'Mexico in Transition':

"The sectarian treachery of the Irish deserters might have proved to be overwhelming. It might have involved the destruction of the whole American force, which was so small comparatively. As it was it cost them nearly one-seventh of their whole number. Nor should it be forgotten that this was not the first time. A few months before a similar act of treachery had occurred in General Taylor's command at Monterey by the same class of men deserting and crossing the river to join their co-religionists on the other side and help them fight the Americans. . . . On some occasions yet to come the celebrated order may need to be repeated as a precaution, 'Put none but Americans on guard tonight.'"

Our military records are well and carefully kept at Washington and their custodians have cheerfully supplied the following official details which effectually dispose of this slander and expose the malice of its originators:

General Scott's official report of the battles of Contreras and Churubusco, fought on the twentieth of August, 1847, shows a

loss in the American army of 139 killed, including 16 officers; wounded, 876, with 60 officers.

That there were many deserters from the American army in the Mexican war there was no doubt. The official record, as summarized in Heitman's "Historical Register," shows that of a total regular enlisted force of 18,403 during that war, there were 5,331 desertions, and of a total enlisted force of 20,639 volunteers there were 3,876 desertions. It is equally true that some of the deserters, a relatively very small number, served in the Mexican army against the United States. General Taylor reports this condition as early as the fight at Fort Brown at the beginning of the war.

Attached hereto is a letter from General Taylor, quoted from Executive Document No. 60, 30th Congress, First Session, in which he reports on this evil in his army, and he annexes to that letter a description of two of the deserters supposed to have been shot, and the proclamation of General Arista, the Mexican Commander-in-Chief, to American soldiers, urging them to join the Mexican army, and showing the nature of the appeals that were made to them to bring about this desertion. It will be noted that General Arista, among other things, says, referring to the soldiers of the United States army. "Besides the most of you are Europeans." This is probably true, and being true, it is probable that a large number of the deserters from the American army would be European.

In so far as these men had been taken into the Mexican army, those not killed, seem from the records, to have been captured at Churubusco. Attached hereto are abstracts from reports of Brigadier General James Shields, commanding the First Brigade of Volunteers, and Major General W. I. Worth, commanding the First Division of regular troops in that battle. It would seem from the reports that the troops under the command of these two officers captured the American deserters. It will be noted that General Shields reports the capture of forty-two and that

General Worth reports the capture of twenty-seven. In neither of these reports is any reference made to the nationality of the prisoners captured. It is quite likely that the nationalities were not mentioned because of the fact that they did not differ from those of the troops capturing them. General Shields himself was an Irishman and General Worth's command, being composed largely of regular troops, had a very large percentage of Irish and other Europeans, a fact which is borne out by a reading of the list of killed and wounded and of those among the enlisted forces recommended for gallant service. General Wilcox, in his history of the Mexican War, has this to say with reference to American deserters captured at the Battle of Churubusco:

"In the battle of Churubusco among the many prisoners captured was the San Patricio Battalion. They were tried by a general court-martial and sentenced to death, all but sixteen being executed; some were pardoned on account of youth when they deserted, two were pardoned because their sons or brothers had remained true to the flag of their country, and O'Riley, having deserted before declaration of war, was not condemned to death, but was branded with the letter 'D' on his cheek."

(From Executive Document No. 60, 30th Congress, First Session, p. 287.)

"A PROCLAMATION.

"By the General Commanding the Army of the U. S. of America.
"To the people of Mexico:

". . . . It is our wish to see you liberated from despots, to drive back the savage Comanches, to prevent the renewal of their assaults, and to compel them to restore to you from captivity your long lost wives and children. Your religion, your altars and churches, the property of your churches and citizens, the emblems of your faith and its ministers, shall be protected and remain inviolate. Hundreds of our army and hundreds of thousands of our people are members of the Catholic Church. In every State, and in nearly every city and village of our Union,

Catholic churches exist, and the priests perform their holy functions in peace and security, under the sacred guarantee of our constitution. We come among the people of Mexico as friends and republican brethren, and all who receive us as such shall be protected, whilst all who are seduced into the army of your dictator shall be treated as enemies. . . .

“Z. TAYLOR,

“Brev. Brig. Gen. U. S. Army, commanding.

“The Adjutant General of the Army,
Washington, D. C.”

The order of General Scott which Hopkins garbled to suit his purpose is as follows:

“Headquarters of the Army,
“Mexico, September 22, 1847.

“General Orders No. 296.

“The General-in-Chief has received, through many kind sources, Mexican and others, undoubted information that an extensive conspiracy is on foot, about us, to surprise (by means of an insurrection) our guards and quarters, and to murder our officers and men.

“Mexican officers and soldiers, in disguise, who had not the courage to defend their capital, are the leaders of this conspiracy, aided by some fifteen hundred thieves and murderers, who were turned loose for that purpose and to prey upon the peaceable inhabitants, the night before the triumphal entry of the American army into this city.

“The conspirators have also the services of several false priests who dishonor the *holy* religion which they only profess for the special occasion.

“*Until ready for the insurrection, the disguised villains hope to do us much harm in detail. Their plan is to assassinate stragglers, particularly drunken men; to entice individuals or small parties into shops, to drink, and to stab them when in their cups; to entice our gallant Roman Catholic soldiers, who have*

done *so much* honor to our colors, to desert, under a promise of lands in California, which our arms have already conquered, and which, forever, will remain a part of the United States.

"Let all our soldiers, Protestant and Catholic, remember the fate of the deserters taken at Churubusco.* These deluded wretches were also promised money and land; but the Mexican government by every sort of ill usage, drove them to take up arms against the country and flag they had voluntarily sworn to support, and next placed them in front of the battle—in positions from which they could not possibly escape the conquering valor of our glorious ranks. After every effort of the General-in-Chief to save, by judicious discrimination, as many of those miserable convicts as possible, fifty of them have paid for their treachery by an ignominious death on the gallows!

"Again the General-in-Chief calls on his brethren in arms, of all grades, to be constantly on the alert, by day, as by night—never to appear in the streets without side arms—to walk out only in parties of twos, threes or more, and to avoid all obscure places—particularly treacherous dram shops and liquor stores.

"By command of Major General Scott:

"H. I. SCOTT,

"A. A. A. G."

In regard to the character of the deserters we have this from Executive Document No. 60, pp. 302-304:

"No. 47.

"Headquarters, Army of Occupation,

"Matamoras, May 30, 1846.

"Sir—In reply to your communication of the eighth instant, calling for information relative to deserters who were shot near Matamoras, I have to state that soon after my arrival on the

*The intent of Hopkins is well shown by the change he made in the following sentence of General Scott's order:

"Let all our soldiers, Protestant and Catholic, remember the fate of the deserters taken at Churubusco."

The article in the *Cavalry Journal* makes that sentence appear as:

"Let all our soldiers professing the Catholic religion remember the fate of the deserters taken at Churubusco."

Rio Grande the evil of desertion made its appearance and increased to an alarming extent; that inducements were held out by the Mexican authorities to entice our men from their colors, and that the most efficient measures were necessary to prevent the spread of this contagion. As our deserters, by merely swimming the river, were at once in the enemy's lines, pursuit and apprehension with a view to trial were out of the question. I therefore deemed it my duty, and warranted by the hostile attitude of the Mexicans, whose commanders assumed that a state of war existed, to give orders that all men seen swimming across the river should be hailed by our pickets and ordered to return; and in case that they did not return, that they should be shot. These orders were verbally given to the several commanders on or about the first of April. I annex a description of two soldiers who are supposed to have been shot under this order, remarking that it was impossible in the first instance to identify the individual with absolute certainty while in the act of crossing the river; and in the second to ascertain whether he were actually killed, the occurrence taking place at night. I beg leave to add that these measures seem to have checked and nearly stopped the practice.

"How far I should have been justified in seeing our ranks daily thinned by the insidious arts of the Mexican general, without resorting to the most efficient steps to stop it, I cheerfully leave to the decision of the War Department. It may not be improper to say that it is known that some of our deserters were employed against us, and actually served guns in the cannonade and bombardment of Fort Brown.

"As connected with this subject, I enclose an original draught, found in General Arista's papers, of an invitation to our soldiers to desert. A similar call was previously made by Ampudia, and has already found its way into the public prints. The department may see from these documents what arms were used against us.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"Z. TAYLOR,

"Brev. Brig. Gen. U. S. A., commanding.

"The Adjutant General of the Army,

Washington, D. C."

No.	Name	Rank	Regiment	Co.	Where born	Remarks
1	Carl Gross	Private	7th inf.	I	France	Deserted April 1st. Supposed to have been shot in attempting to cross the Rio Grande.
2	Henry Daub	Private	5th inf.	D	Switzerland	Deserted April 5th. Fired upon and supposed to have been killed in attempting to cross the Rio Grande.

"Headquarters, Army of Occupation,

"Matamoras, May 31, 1846.

"W. W. S. BLISS,

"Assistant Adjutant General."

General Arista's advice to the soldiers of the United States army was given in this fashion:

"Soldiers! You have been enlisted in time of peace to serve in that army for a specific term, but your obligation never implied that you were bound to violate the laws of God, and the most sacred rights of friends! The United States government, contrary to the wishes of a majority of all honest and honorable Americans, has ordered you to take *forcible* possession of the

territory of a *friendly* neighbor, who has never given her consent to such occupation. In other words, while the treaty of peace and commerce between Mexico and the United States is in full force, the United States, presuming on her strength and prosperity, and on our supposed imbecility and cowardice, attempts to make you the blind instruments of her unholy and mad ambition, and *forces* you to appear as the hateful robbers of our dear homes, and the unprovoked violators of our dearest feelings as men and patriots. Such villainy and outrage I know are perfectly repugnant to the noble sentiments of any gentleman; and it is base and foul to rush you on to certain death, in order to aggrandize a few lawless individuals, in defiance of the laws of God and man! It is to no purpose if they tell you that the law for the annexation of Texas justifies your occupation of the Rio Bravo del Norte; for by this act they rob us of a great part of Tamaulipas, Coahuila, Chihuahua, and New Mexico, and it is barbarous to send a handful of men on such an errand against a powerful and warlike nation. Besides, the most of you are Europeans, and we are the *declared friends* of a majority of the nations of *Europe*. The North Americans are ambitious, overbearing, and insolent, as a nation, and they will only make use of you as vile tools to carry out their abominable plans of pillage and rapine. I warn you, in the name of justice, honor, and your own interests and self-respect, to abandon their desperate and unholy cause, and become *peaceful Mexican citizens*. I guaranty you, in such case, a half section of land, or 320 acres, to settle upon, gratis. Be wise, then, and just and honorable, and take no part in murdering us who have no unkind feelings for you. Lands shall be given to officers, sergeants, and corporals according to rank, privates receiving 320 acres, as stated.

"If in time of action you wish to espouse *our* cause, throw away your arms and run to us, and we will embrace you as true friends and Christians.

"It is not decent or prudent to say more. But should any

of you render any important service to Mexico you shall be accordingly considered and preferred.

“Headquarters at Matamoras, April 20, 1846.

“M. ARISTA,

“Commander-in-Chief of Mexican army.”

Report of Brevet Major General W. J. Worth, U. S. A. (Executive Document No. 1, 30th Congress, First Session, Senate, page 319) :

“Headquarters, First Division,

“Tacubaya, August 23, 1847.

“Of prisoners, we paused to make but few; although receiving the surrender of many, to disarm and pass them was deemed sufficient. Among them, however, are secured twenty-seven deserters from our own army, arrayed in the most tawdry Mexican uniforms. These wretches served the guns—the use of which they had been taught in our own service—and with fatal effect, upon the persons of their former comrades!”

Report of Lieut. Col. E. A. Hitchcock, A. Insp. Gen. (Executive Document No. 1, 30th Congress, First Session, page 349) :

“Headquarters of the United States Army,

“Inspector Gen. Dept., Tacubaya, Mexico, Aug. 25, 1847.

“General—I have the honor to report that I have been furnished with lists of prisoners of the Mexican army, captured by the American forces under your command, in the several conflicts before the City of Mexico, on the 20th instant, by which I am enabled to present the following recapitulation, which I presume to be accurate:

“Generals, 8; Colonels, 5; Lieutenant-Colonels, 11; Majors, 1; Aids-de-camp, 4; Adjutants, 2; Captains, 57; First Lieutenants, 45; Second Lieutenants, 68; Ensigns, 3; Cadet, 1; non-commissioned officers, rank and file, 2,432; total, 2,637.

“Of the eight general officers, to wit: General Perdigon Garey, General Anaya, General Salas, General Mendoza, General Blanco, General Garcia, General Arellano and General Rincon; the two

first (Generals Garey and Anaya) have been, by your order, unconditionally released, 'in consideration of their high civil positions as members of the Mexican national congress.'

"Generals Blanco and Garcia, both wounded, have been, at their own request, and by your order, paroled, 'to enable them to receive the attention of their friends and families.'

"In addition to which Colonels Radrequez and Fuero, both wounded, have been paroled for a like purpose; and permission has also been given for the removal to the City of Mexico of about forty-five wounded soldiers, who were to have been designated by the Mexican surgeon-general.

"I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"E. A. HITCHCOCK, Lt. Col. A. Ins. Gen.

"Major General Winfield Scott,

"General-in-Chief of the American armies before the city of Mexico."

Report of Brigadier General James Shields, commanding First Brigade Volunteers (Executive Document No. 1, 30th Congress, First Session, Senate, page 344):

"Headquarters First Brigade Volunteer Division,

"San Augustin, Mexico, August 24, 1847.

"In this last engagement my command captured 380 prisoners, including six officers. Of this number forty-two had deserted from the American army during the war, and at their head was found the notorious O'Reilly, who had fought against our troops at Monterey and elsewhere. A particular and detailed report of the loss, as also of the prisoners captured by the command, accompanies this report."

It should be noted that neither in the appeal of General Ampudia to the American soldiers to desert, nor in the contemporaneous reports of the American generals, is there any reference to the fact that the deserters were of one religion rather than another. On the other hand, in the proclamation of General

Taylor to the people of Mexico, already quoted, the religious appeal was made apparently not by the Mexicans to their co-religionists in the United States Army, but by the commanding general of the United States forces to the Mexican people. It may be noted that this proclamation of General Taylor was prepared in the War Department and sent to him by a letter from the Secretary of War, dated June 4, 1846, and was acknowledged by General Taylor in a letter dated June 26, 1846.

The following notes bear on the San Patricio companies serving in the Mexican army during the war between the United States and Mexico:

“La Invasion Americana,” a publication by Manuel Balbontin, a junior lieutenant of artillery during the war, published by him in 1883, and dedicated to General Porfirio Diaz, after describing the battle of Monterey, beginning on September 26, 1846, and the march to San Luis Potosi, where the army arrived October 17, says, under the heading “Battle of Angostura,” known to Americans as the battle of Buena Vista, in describing the advance from San Luis to the battle field:

“January 27, moved out: The Battalion of Zapadores, three companies of foot artillery; a company of Irish volunteers.”

In commenting on the lack of artillery of this army, which he deprecates, he says finally “he might have used the Irish Volunteers that in San Luis had drilled in the service of the pieces.” These volunteers or this company of volunteers are not mentioned again until he reaches the attack and surrender of Churubusco, when he says, speaking of the fortification of Churubusco, “the garrison of the fort was composed of the battalions of the national guard called ‘Independencia’ and ‘Bravos’; I believe also some troops of the South and Irish companies of San Patricio, as well as a number of pieces served by horse and foot artillery.”

In a small volume published at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1848,

called "Encarnacion Prisoners," being an account of the march of the Kentucky cavalry from Louisville to the Rio Grande, together with a history of the captivity of the American prisoners captured at Encarnacion, the author says, in describing the march of these prisoners under guard from Encarnacion, where they were captured, to San Luis Potosi, after speaking of meeting the Mexican army under General Santa Anna on its march from San Luis Potosi to the battlefield of Buena Vista:

"Among the mighty host we passed was O'Reilly and his company of deserters bearing aloft in high disgrace the holy banner of St. Patrick. One of these fellows was a Dutchman, who said to Corporal Sharp of Captain Heady's company, tauntingly: 'Well, you is goin' to Shan Louish, hey?' 'Yes,' replied Sharp, 'I am, and you ish goin' to Saltillo, hey?' 'Yesh,' replied the Dutchman. 'Then you ish goin' to h—ll in ten days,' rejoined Sharp. Some of these fellows were swept away by the cannon and musketry of Buena Vista, while others of them were reserved for a more appropriate doom."

In the "Notes for the History of the War between Mexico and the United States," being a joint composition of a number of Mexican literary men, translated and published, with notes, by Colonel Albert C. Ramsey of the 11th Infantry during the war with Mexico, the text says, in describing the march of Santa Anna's army from San Luis to the battlefield of Buena Vista:

"The movement of the army commenced on the 28th of January, the day on which all the artillery, with their trains and the material of war, moved out, accompanied by a battalion of sappers and a company of San Patricio."

And the editor adds in a footnote:

"The company of San Patricio, Saint Patrick, was composed of deserters from the American army. They were all Europeans, and some of them deserters from the British army in Canada, who afterwards had enlisted in the United States, and thence passing over to the enemy at Matamoras and Monterey."

Again in describing the fight at Churubusco the text says: "Yet, moved by what was said, Santa Anna sent as reinforcements some pickets of Tlapa and Lagos and the company of San Patricio. . . .

"The only men who used this park were the soldiers of the San Patricio, whose muskets were of the corresponding calibre. Their deportment deserves the greatest eulogies, since all the time the attack lasted they sustained the fire with extraordinary courage. A great number of them fell in the action; while those who survived, more unfortunate than their companions, suffered soon after a cruel death or horrible torments, improper in a civilized age, and from a people who aspire to the title of illustrious and humane.*"

The American editor explains in a footnote:

"These Patricios were deserters from the American army, as has already been mentioned in a former note. In a general court-martial twenty-nine of them were tried and found guilty; sixteen of them were hung at San Angel on the 10th of September. Some were branded on the cheek with the letter D, who had deserted before the actual commencement of hostilities, and received in addition the lash well laid on. Others were recommended to mercy, and some had mitigating circumstances in their favor; all of whom, of course, were pardoned by General Scott. This American General is one of the last men in the world against whom the charge of cruelty with any justice can be brought. His humanity on all occasions, his kindness as evinced to every individual and his sympathy and attention to the sick and wounded, endeared him to the whole army, officers and soldiers. In fact, the very generosity and excellence of his heart led him sometimes too far, and he has since reaped in ingratitude the good seed sown in the fullness of his noble sensibilities. But it does not become the Mexicans to criticise this proper treatment of the deserters, since they have meted out the same punishment of death to their deserters."

General Wilcox, in his history of the Mexican War, has this to say with reference to American deserters captured at the Battle of Churubusco:

"In the battle of Churubusco among the many prisoners captured was the San Patricio Battalion. They were tried by a general court-martial and sentenced to death, all but sixteen being executed; some were pardoned on account of youth when they deserted, two were pardoned because their sons or brothers had remained true to the flag of their country, and O'Riley having deserted before declaration of war, was not condemned to death, but was branded with the letter 'D' on his cheek."

In the official reports of General Scott of his operations in Mexico, as well as in his published autobiography, there is no mention of this company or companies. This is likewise true of the official reports of General Taylor of his operations in Mexico. The presence of these men at the battle of Buena Vista is not mentioned in the published official reports of the American commanders at that battle.

The records make it perfectly clear that the presence of these companies, composed at least in part of deserters from the American army, could not be mentioned without disgust by American officers who were prominent in the Mexican War. Their presence was of no importance to the Mexicans. Their service against the United States was valueless to the Mexican army, and the mention of them was not essential to a very complete account of what occurred in the war.

In "The War with Mexico," by R. S. Ripley, who was a lieutenant of the Second Regiment of Artillery during the war, published in 1849, he has the following to say with reference to these deserters:

"The most important duty assigned to courts-martial was the trial of the prisoners of the Battalion of San Patricio. Without exception these were deserters from the American army, and the whole number, sixty-nine, were put upon trial. During the con-

tinuance of the armistice most of them were found guilty and sentenced. Those who had deserted during the war were sentenced to death; but all those who had deserted before the actual commencement of hostilities received only corporal punishment and military imprisonment."

This quotation is followed by a justification of the execution of these men.

In the "History of the Mexican War," by Edward D. Mansfield, published in 1848, is this reference to the deserters:

"Before we proceed, however, to narrate events of new and extraordinary interest in the valley of Mexico, we must turn aside to witness another and a sadder tragedy, one in which no rays of glory light up the darkness of death, but gloomy curtains of despair and shame are drawn round the unpitied and unhonored criminal. Desertion in the face of an enemy, and during the existence of actual war, has been, among all nations and in all time, punished with death. It is treason—disloyalty in its worst, least excusable, and most dangerous form. Of this crime were 'the companies of St. Patrick' palpably and undeniably guilty. They had fought in the ranks of the Mexican army, at the batteries of Churubusco; they had fought longest and hardest against those very colors which they had sworn to defend; they were deserters, and many of them were taken prisoners. Soon after the battles of the 20th, and while the negotiations were pending, twenty-nine of these men were tried by a general court-martial, of which Colonel Riley of the Second Infantry was president. The court found these men guilty (two-thirds of the whole court concurring in each several case), and sentenced each one of them to hang by the neck till dead. In a general order, dated the 8th of September, General Scott approved the sentence, with the exception of three, who had deserted previous to the commencement of the war, and two others, who were recommended to favor by the court; and four, in whose palliation there appeared some mitigating circum-

stances. The remainder were executed according to the sentence. Sixteen were executed at San Angel, on the 10th of September. Six of the whole number tried were deserters from the Third Infantry, three from the Fifth Infantry, four from the Seventh Infantry, two from the Second Infantry, five from the Third Artillery, six from the Fourth Artillery, one from the First Artillery, and two from the Second Dragoons. General Scott, in examining the proceedings of the court, appears to have released every man from the penalty of death, in whose favor any reason or mitigation could be pleaded. Among the three whom he found were not legally subject to the penalty of death, because they had deserted previous to the commencement of the war, was the notorious Riley, the commander of the deserters' company. His sentence was commuted, so that he was lashed and branded. The lesson given by this terrible execution was undoubtedly a severe one, but one which war necessarily carries with it, and without which the discipline of the army could not be maintained."

It will be observed that Mr. Mansfield assumes that the twenty-nine men tried by Colonel Riley's court was the entire number of these deserters so tried. This is an error as the entire number tried was sixty-six, as given in other statements.

A careful search of publications by important participants in the Mexican War and contemporary observers fails to develop further information with reference to these men.

In regard to desertions in general from the American army, General Taylor says in a letter to the Adjutant General from Opposite Matamoras, Texas, April 6, 1846:

"Efforts are continually making to entice our men to desert, and, I regret to say, have met with considerable success. Four, however, have been drowned in swimming the river, and two have been killed by our pickets while attempting to desert, which has operated to check the practice. A majority of those who have deserted are old offenders."

This letter is quoted in full in Executive Document No. 60, First Session, Thirtieth Congress, page 133. This letter was followed by an inquiry from the Adjutant General's office on this subject, which was answered by General Taylor in the letter with its inclosure already quoted. The inclosure is interesting as showing the inducements held out by General Arista, commanding the Mexican Army of the North, to the soldiers of the American Army.

Two proclamations issued by General Scott are to be found in Executive Document 60, First Session, 30th Congress, p. 937:

"Headquarters of the Army,
Vera Cruz, April 11, 1847.

"Major General Scott, General-in-Chief of the Armies of the United States of America:

"To the Good People of Mexico.

"PROCLAMATION.

"Mexicans! At the head of a powerful army, soon to be doubled, a part of which is advancing upon your capital, and with another army under Major General Taylor, in march from Saltillo towards San Luis de Potosi, I think myself called upon to address you.

"Mexicans! Americans are not your enemies, but the enemies, for a time, of the men who, a year ago, misgoverned you, and brought about this unnatural war between two great republics. We are the friends of the peaceful inhabitants of the country we occupy, and the friends of your holy religion, its hierarchy, and its priesthood. The same church is found in all parts of our own country, crowded with devout Catholics, and respected by our government, laws and people.

"For the Church of Mexico, the unoffending inhabitants of the country, and their property, I have, from the first, done everything in my power to place them under the safe guard of *martial-law*, against the few bad men in this army.

"My orders to that effect, known to all, are precise and rigorous. Under them, several Americans have already been punished, by fine, for the benefit of Mexicans, besides imprisonment; and one, for a rape, has been hung by the neck.

"Is this not a proof of good faith and energetic discipline? Other proofs shall be given as often as injuries to Mexicans may be detected.

"On the other hand, injuries committed by individuals, or parties of Mexico, not belonging to the public forces, upon individuals, small parties, trains of wagons and teams, or of pack mules, or any other person or property belonging to this army, contrary to the laws of war, shall be punished with rigor; or, if the particular offenders be not delivered up by the Mexican authorities, the punishment shall fall upon entire cities, towns, or neighborhoods.

"Let, then, all good Mexicans remain at home, or at their peaceful occupations; but they are invited to bring in for sale, horses, mules, beef, cattle, corn, barley, wheat, flour for bread, and vegetables. Cash will be paid for everything this army may take or purchase, and protection will be given to all sellers. The Americans are strong enough to offer these assurances, which, should Mexicans wisely accept, this war may soon be happily ended, to the honor and advantage of both belligerents. Then, the Americans, having converted enemies into friends, will be happy to take leave of Mexico, and return to their own country.

"WINFIELD SCOTT."

Executive Document 60, First Session, 30th Congress, p. 971.
"The General-in-Chief of the Armies of the United States of America, to the Mexican Nation.

"Mexicans:

" . . . Neither can I believe Mexicans ignorant of the infamy, of the calumnies put forth by the press, in order to excite hostility against us. No; public spirit cannot be created nor animated by falsehood. We have not profaned your temples, nor

abused your women, nor seized your property, as they would have you believe. We say it with pride and we confirm it by an appeal to your bishops and the curates of Tampico, Tuzpan, Matamoras, Monterey, Vera Cruz, and Jalapa; to all the clergy, civil authorities, and inhabitants of all the places we have occupied.

“We adore the same God, and a large portion of our army, as well as of the people of the United States, is Catholic like yourselves. We punish crime wherever we find it, and reward merit and virtue.

“The army of the United States respects, and will ever respect, private property of every class, and the property of the Mexican Church. Woe to him who does not—where we are.”

“WINFIELD SCOTT.”

Headquarters of the Army, Jalapa, May 11, 1847.

In “The War with Mexico Reviewed,” by Abiel Abbot Livermore, published in Boston in 1850, there appears in Chapter XIII, entitled, “Military Executions,” after reciting a number of executions for various offenses, the following:

“But the most cruel and sanguinary scene that was probably ever enacted in war under the form of its Draconic code of laws, occurred at the villages of San Angel and Mixoac in the valley of Mexico. On the 9th of September, 1847, sixteen deserters were hung at San Angel, and on the 10th, four were hung at Mixoac. But as if these victims were not enough to glut the cruel spirit of war, on the 13th, thirty more were hung at Mixoac, making in all fifty victims of capital punishment in four days.

“The rest of this battalion of San Patricio,* under the command of Reilly, who were captured when desperately fighting at Contreras and Churubusco against the Americans, were severely punished.”

“*Nativity of the Deserters—The New York *Police Gazette* contains the names and places of nativity of the deserters recently recaptured by our army, from which we are sorry to learn that a large portion were Americans. They are classed as follows: Americans 54, Irishmen 34, Germans 17, Scotch 4, and one each from England, Nova Scotia, France and Poland.”

The following note is printed at the beginning of this publication:

"NOTE.—The Committee of Award, consisting of the Hon. Simon Greenleaf, LL.D., the Rev. William Jenks, D.D., and the Rev. Baron Stow, D.D., adjudged to the following work the Premium of Five Hundred Dollars offered by the American Peace Society for 'the best Review of the Mexican War on the principles of Christianity, and an enlightened statesmanship.'"

"George C. Beckwith,
"Cor. Sec. Am. Peace Society."

President Polk wished to avail himself of the services of Archbishop Hughes of New York as a peace envoy to Mexico, but such a plan was not found to be practical.

When the war with Mexico began the law did not provide for the appointment of chaplains, and much indignation was rife throughout Catholic circles over the punishment inflicted by fanatical military chiefs on Catholic soldiers who had refused to attend Protestant services sanctioned by regimental officials. This trouble greatly annoyed President Polk, Secretary of State Buchanan, Secretary of War Marcy and other civil officers. By request Bishops Hughes of New York, Portier of Mobile and Kenrick of St. Louis, who were in Baltimore in attendance at the Sixth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy, went to Washington, on May 20, 1846, and called at the White House, where President Polk consulted them about the appointment of Catholic chaplains for the army. He expressed a great wish to have such appointments made and asked the Bishops to give him the names of two priests to whom commissions would at once be issued.

After a very pleasant interview with the President the Bishops retired to Georgetown College and decided that two Fathers of the Society of Jesus should be selected. On consultation with Father Verhaegen, the Visitor of the Society, Father John McElroy, then pastor of Trinity Church, Wash-

ington, and Father Anthony Rey, the Minister at the College and Secretary to the Provincial, were designated for the chaplaincies. Their names were sent at once to President Polk, who directed that they be appointed chaplains for the Catholic soldiers. What happened after this is told by Father McElroy in a reminiscence he contributed to the *Woodstock Letters* (Vol. XV, 1886):

"In a few days," says Father McElroy, "the two Fathers called on the Secretary of War for instructions how to proceed. He (Mr. Marcy) received us very affably, expressed his desire that we should visit the President, and ordered his chief clerk to prepare letters for the Commanders of different posts to facilitate our journey; besides he requested me to give him my views of what he should expect while with the Army, which I sent him a little later in writing and which he embodied, almost transcribed, in his despatch to General Taylor. The Secretary introduced us to the President, who received us with great kindness and regard; he expressed a hope that our mission would be one of peace; that *we* carried not the sword, but the olive branch, that our mission would be a refutation of the erroneous opinions held in Mexico, that the United States warred against their religion, etc. He continued to state very frankly the great desire he had to bring their matters of dispute to an amicable conclusion.

"As neither of us could speak Spanish I proposed to the President the propriety of associating with us a third clergyman who was familiar with the language. He very promptly adopted my suggestion and told the Secretary to embody that in his despatch to the General-in-Chief, where it will be found.

"In a subsequent interview the Secretary of War asked us what we thought sufficient for our expenses. I replied that I was ignorant of it, not knowing the country, our manner of living, etc. He observed that when the law authorized chaplains their pay was from \$1,000 to \$1,200. I told him that this would appear to be sufficient, he inserted in his despatch the larger amount. Although there is no law of Congress authorizing the

appointment of chaplains for the Army the President in our case made out our commissions by virtue of his discretionary power, besides the pay of \$100 a month, our traveling expenses to and from the seat of war were to be defrayed. An advance to each of three months' pay was made and \$100 each for traveling, making in all \$800. This sum we received at the Quartermaster's office in gold on June 1, 1846."

The letter of the Secretary of War to Father McElroy states the views of the President precisely and was as follows:

"War Department, May 21, 1846.

"Sir—The President is desirous to engage two Reverend gentlemen of the Roman Catholic Church to attend the army of occupation now on the Rio Grande to officiate as chaplains, etc. In his opinion their services would be important in many respects to the public interest, particularly in the present condition of our affairs with Mexico. Having sought information as to the proper persons to be thus employed, his attention has been directed to you, and he has instructed me to address you on the subject in the hope that you may consider it not incompatible with your clerical duties or your personal feelings to yield to his request.

"It is proper that I should apprise you that the existing laws do not authorize the President to appoint and commission chaplains, but he has authority to employ persons to perform such duties as appertain to chaplains. Should you consent, as the President hopes you will, to visit the Army and remain some time with it you will be allowed a reasonable compensation for expenses and services. Your views of what that ought to be you will, if you please, suggest to me.

"When the law authorized the appointment of chaplains, as it formerly did, the pay and emoluments were about \$1,000 or \$1,200 per annum. This amount would be readily allowed together with the expenses of traveling to and from the Army.

"I should be pleased to be favored with a reply to this communication at your earliest convenience.

"I have the honor to be,

"Very respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. L. MARCY,

"To the Reverend

"Secretary of War.

John McElroy,

Georgetown College."

A similar letter was sent to Father Rey and both communications, as will be seen, were written the day after the visit of the Bishops to President Polk. The instructions given to General Taylor by Secretary Marcy in regard to the standing, pay and expenses of the two chaplains are to be found in the following letters:

"(*Confidential*)

"War Department, Washington, May 29, 1846.

"Sir—The President has been informed that much pains have been taken to alarm the religious prejudices of the Mexicans against the United States. He deems it important that their misapprehensions in this respect should be corrected as far as it can be done, and for that purpose has invited the Reverend gentlemen who will hand you this communication, Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey of the Roman Catholic Church to attend to the army under your command and to officiate as chaplains. Although the President cannot appoint them as chaplains yet it is his wish that they be received in that character by you and your officers, be respected as such and be treated with kindness and courtesy, that they should be permitted to have intercourse with the soldiers of the Catholic faith, to administer to their religious instruction, to perform divine service for such as may wish to attend whenever it can be done without interfering with their military duties, and to have free access to the sick or wounded in hospitals or elsewhere.

"It is confidently believed that these gentlemen in their clerical capacity will be useful in removing the false impressions of the Mexicans in relation to the United States, and in inducing them to confide in the assurance you have already given that their religious institutions will be respected, the property of the Church protected, their worship undisturbed, and in fine all their religious rights will be in the amplest manner preserved to them. In fulfilling those objects you are desired to give these gentlemen such facilities as you may be enabled to afford, and at such times as in your judgment may be most prudent.

"You are requested also to cause to be provided for them such accommodations as will render their abiding with the Army comfortable to themselves. It is believed that when chaplains were allowed by law to the Army they received in pay and emoluments from \$1,000 to \$1,200 per annum. This amount will be paid to the gentlemen named in this letter.

"As these gentlemen do not speak Spanish they have been desired by the President to associate with them another clergyman who both understands and speaks it; such person recommended by them you will receive on the same footing as themselves.

"Very respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. L. MARCY,

"Secretary of War.

"Major-General Z. Taylor,

Commanding Army of Occupation

on the Rio Grande, Texas."

The letters issued to the chaplains to facilitate the details of their traveling and accommodations on the way to the front were worded in this fashion:

"War Department, May 29, 1846.

"Sir—The Reverend gentlemen (Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey), who will hand you this, are the bearers of a communication from

this department to Major-General Taylor, who will please provide them with cabin passages, in good sufficient transport to Point Isabel, whence they will receive safe conduct to General Taylor's Headquarters.

“Very respectfully,

“Your obedient servant,

“W. L. MARCY,

“Secretary of War.

“Lieutenant-Colonel Thos. Hunt,
Deputy Quartermaster General,
United States Army,
New Orleans.”

The letter to the commanding officer at Fort Polk, Point Isabel, Texas, said:

“War Department, May 29, 1846.

“Sir—The Reverend Mr. McElroy and Mr. Rey are the bearers of a communication from this department to Major-General Taylor; they are recommended to your courtesy and hospitality, and you are requested to take such measures as will ensure their safe conduct to the headquarters of General Taylor.

“Very respectfully yours, etc.,

“W. L. MARCY,

“Secretary of War.

Fathers McElroy and Rey left Georgetown on June 2, 1846, and arrived at Fort Polk on July 2. In the hospital there they found fifteen wounded Catholic soldiers, all Irish except two, who were Mexicans. Thence they passed on to Matamoras, which was reached four days later. The Mexican *Padre Cura* Rodriguez received them hospitably and invited them to stop with him, but they took rooms in the house of an American, paying him \$10 a week for their board. When they called on General Taylor he “received us in the most friendly manner and begged us to give him the opportunity of rendering us all the service in his power.” Father McElroy thought Matamoras had no houses

of importance, "no good churches . . . so much for the effects of the revolution. Since the Spanish yoke was cast off not one church as yet has been erected throughout all Mexico, whereas in towns existing when the revolt commenced are to be found good substantial churches well adorned."

Early in August General Taylor advanced to Comargo on the road to Monterey, and as a large proportion of his command were Catholics Father Rey accompanied him. He was present at the battle of Monterey fearlessly ministering to the combatants, but, some time after, venturing out into the country alone he was murdered by Mexican guerrillas. His body was never recovered. Father Rey was born at Lyons, France, March 19, 1807, and became a Jesuit novice in Switzerland in 1827. From 1840 he had labored in the United States as professor of philosophy at Georgetown, as Secretary to the Provincial and Vice-President of Georgetown College.

Father McElroy continued to act as chaplain during the war and then returned to Boston, where he labored for seventeen years, during which time he built the Church of the Immaculate Conception and founded Boston College. He frequently visited New York and was with Archbishop Hughes when that prelate died. In 1868 he lost his eyesight, but an operation restored it for five years. He then became totally blind. Born in 1782, in the County Fermanagh, Ireland, he landed in New York in 1803. Three years later he entered the Jesuit Novitiate at Georgetown and was ordained priest in May, 1817. As he lived until September 12, 1877, he was a link from the days of Carroll almost to our own.

DESTRUCTION OF THE CHARLESTOWN CONVENT

STATEMENT BY THE LEADER OF THE KNOWNNOTHING MOB.

A correspondent of the Boston *Globe*, in 1887, hunted up the leader of the Knownnothing mob that burned the Charlestown, Massachusetts, convent, on the night of August 11, 1834, and got from him his account of the great outrage in which he took so prominent a part. It is reproduced here as it appears in the files of the *Globe*, although it bristles with falsehoods, many of them old and refuted over and over again, and others entirely new and original with the narrator, as the best possible index both of this man's character and of the Knownnothing spirit which prompted, applauded and defended his deed. It also makes an interesting supplement to the paper on the Charlestown infamy contributed by Mr. Peter Condon to RECORDS AND STUDIES, Vol. IV, pp. 218-232.—Ed. RECORDS AND STUDIES.

Pittsfield, N. H., Dec. 24.—On the shore of one of New Hampshire's beautiful lakes, surrounded by the friends of his youth, and kindly cared for by loving friends, lives a man who was once tried for his life, and whose trial and acquittal caused greater excitement throughout Eastern Massachusetts than any criminal procedure before or since. That man is John R. Buzzell, the leader of the mob that burned the Charlestown nunnery on the night of August 11, 1834. He was born within a short distance of the place where he now lives, in 1805, but when a young man he left home and learned the trade of brickmaking, at which he was employed when called upon to lead the infuriated rioters in their work of destruction. In his youth he was noted for his tremendous strength and extraordinary agility, which were tested in many a hard struggle with the bullies of the Massachusetts coast. In form he was a perfect picture of physical

manhood, measuring six feet six inches in height, while his broad shoulders and stalwart limbs gave him the appearance of a giant. It is told of him that at the time of the burning of the nunnery he could stand with a cross bar at the height of his chin, and leap over it at a single spring, without touching his hands.

The stories of his youthful prowess in wrestling and hand-to-hand fights contain many thrilling episodes, and, if half of them are true, it is little wonder that he was looked upon as a hero in those days when duelling among the bloods and fighting with the bare hands among the workingmen were the accepted methods of settling all personal difficulties.

He is spending his declining years in the home of his niece, having laid up what is a competence for his modest wants. Here the children of the neighbors love to congregate, and with his grand-nephews and grand-nieces, gather around the old man's knee while he tells them of the victories of his youth. The older people, too, are not averse to hearing Uncle John's spirited stories, which are told with buoyancy and humor, and with no touch of that garrulosity so common to old age. Of course the story of the burning of the nunnery is the favorite with his hearers, and when, in the long winter evenings, a goodly company of the neighbors have gathered together if conversation lags some one is sure to say:

"Now, Uncle John, tell us the story of the Charlestown nunnery."

For many years he feared to tell the story before strangers, but now, protected by his venerable white hair, he narrates his part of those exciting scenes with the greatest freedom. Chancing to spend an afternoon at his home recently, the writer was rewarded by hearing an account of that night's work which came so near costing him his life. His story was as follows:

I suppose it is best to begin at the beginning, so that the whys and wherefores may be understood. In 1834 I was at work in a brickyard in Charlestown, Mass., where I had been em-

ployed for some years, and where I had acquired considerable reputation as a fighter and wrestler. The brickyard was owned by Benjamin Parker, and was situated just south of what was then Jackman's tavern. The nunnery was situated about a quarter of a mile from the brickyard, on Mount Benedict, which lies about halfway between Bunker and Winter hills. It was a large three-story building of brick and stone, its length being, I believe, 105 feet, and around it were several other smaller buildings—the cook-house, Bishop's lodge, ice-house, and farmhouse and barn. In front of it, at the foot of the hill, ran the old canal from Lowell to Boston, which was at this point spanned by two small bridges.

The tow-path ran on the south side of the canal until it reached the nunnery grounds, from which point the opposite side was used, the horses crossing over by means of bridges. Thus there was no tow-path between the canal and the grounds of the nunnery, although the canal company owned a strip of land a rod in width on that side, which they could have used for that purpose had they desired. The facts about this part of the canal I remember with great distinctness, because I had frequently repaired the tow-path here when I had a spare day from the brick-yard.

What has this to do with the burning of the nunnery? Wait and you will see.

The trouble with the nunnery began in 1831, three years previous to its destruction, when stories began to be circulated as to the ill-treatment of the nuns. Suspicion was still further aroused by the escape from the nunnery of a girl named Rebecca Theresa Reed, who had been taken in as a charity girl. Happening to hear the Lady Superior and the Bishop talking of removing her to Montreal, she ran away, and got to the house of a Mr. Kidder, who kept a tollgate on the old turnpike road from Charlestown to Medford. The Bishop tried to get her to return but she refused to do so, and finally went away, and was not heard from

again. From this time we all looked upon the nunnery with disfavor, and many stories of cruel practices within its walls were told and believed.

One Saturday in June, I think, 1834, a man and his wife came from the country to Charlestown on a visit to a blacksmith named Lamson. During the day Mrs. Lamson and her guest, accompanied by a lady who lived near by, went to look at the canal, which was a curiosity to the country people at that time. When the party arrived at the bridges in front of the nunnery, they crossed over to the south side, and continued their walk close to the canal. As they strolled along they were seen by the Lady Superior, who sent her superintendent, an Irishman named Rossiter, with a dog, to bring the women up to the nunnery, claiming that they were desecrating the holy ground. In attempting to force the women to go to the nunnery, Rossiter was unnecessarily rough, handling one of them so harshly as to leave black and blue marks on her arms, and other parts of her person. Some men who were at work on the canal witnessed the assault on the women, and while I was at dinner they came and offered me one dollar and agreed to pay the costs if I would lick Rossiter. I accepted the offer. On the following morning I caught him about fifty rods below my boarding house and licked him so faithfully that the doctor who attended him testified that it was nine days before they could turn him in bed.

There was in the nunnery at this time a girl who went by the name of Mary St. John. She was a teacher of music and lace making, and having more liberty than the rest, she took a favorable opportunity and ran away. She went up to Watertown to one Squire Thaxter's, one of whose daughters had taken lessons on the piano from her. Thaxter informed the Lady Superior that Mary was at his house, and she was induced to return to the nunnery by a promise from the Bishop that she should have full liberty to go and come as she pleased. It was also said that he promised her \$1,000 in money. In spite of the promises she was

kept in close confinement after returning to the nunnery, and stories of her being badly treated leaked out through servants.

Mary St. John had a brother who was mate on a vessel, and who lived at the South. I have forgotten his name, which would not be the same as his sister's, because hers was changed immediately upon entering the nunnery. At the time of which I have been speaking he came to Charlestown, and calling at the nunnery asked to see his sister. He was denied the privilege, which, when it became generally known, following as it did the assault on the woman, caused great excitement throughout the town. So intense was the feeling that a town meeting was held, at which the selectmen were instructed to go to the nunnery and see whether Mary was to leave or not. The selectmen went, but were not permitted to see her, nor could they obtain any satisfactory information concerning her.

This increased the excitement, and it became the prevailing opinion that Mary either had been or was to be put out of the way. Another town meeting was held, at which the selectmen were authorized to find the woman, dead or alive, and to use force if necessary. They were instructed to report in the *Bunker Hill Roarer*, a weekly paper which was published in Charlestown every Saturday.

The next issue of that sheet was quickly purchased and its columns eagerly scanned, but it contained no report from the selectmen, and the conclusion was reached that the selectmen found the business so bad that they were unwilling to make a report for fear of mob violence. On the morning of Monday, August 11, 1834, one of my strikers went to Boston, and on his return in the afternoon came to me and said:

“They are coming out of Boston to take down the nunnery to-night.”

I was a little late in finishing work that night, and when I reached home the rest had all got through supper. I sat down, and had hardly begun eating when a stranger came in and asked

for "Old R," by which nickname I was commonly known at that time. I answered that I was the man, and he asked me to step to the door, as he wanted to see me. I told him to wait until I had finished my supper, but he went out, but came in twice or three times before I got through. Finally I went out, and found about thirty men gathered about the door. They said they wanted to go to the nunnery, but I tried to dissuade them, telling them they had no right on the holy ground.

But they insisted on going, saying: "You are the man who licked Rossiter, and just the man to lead us."

So I finally consented, and marched off at the head of the crowd, which increased rapidly as we proceeded toward the nunnery. When we arrived at the door the Lady Superior came out and began to harangue us. She was the sauciest woman I ever heard talk. She concluded by saying:

"If you meddle with us, the Bishop has 30,000 men, who will burn your houses over your heads."

We then went back down to the street and held a consultation at which a motion to tear the buildings down being unanimously passed, we returned to the nunnery. On our arrival the men employed there, of whom there were four, including Rossiter, fired pistols in the air to intimidate us. This had the opposite effect, however, and made us all the more determined to clean the establishment out. I said to the men:

"There's a factory down here where they make tarred twine. Let's get some tar barrels and build a fire, and that will bring out the fire boys, who will help us tear down the buildings."

I took two men with me, and we got three tar barrels, which we set up on land owned by a man named Kelley, close to the fence which formed the boundary line between Kelley's property and that of the nunnery. When they got well to blazing I ran down on the street shouting "Fire!" at the top of my voice. Then Walker's meeting-house bell struck the alarm, and this was followed by a general alarm in Boston, Medford and other neigh-

boring towns, the fire being on a high hill and visible from a great distance. The boys had torn down the fence and piled it upon the tar barrels, so that from a distance it looked like a great conflagration.

Enough engines responded to have flooded the whole hill, but only one, the North End, No. 2, of Boston, went to the nunnery, the others stopping at the foot of the hill. Not one of them played a stream during the entire conflagration, while many of the firemen were aiders and abettors of the mob, which by this time numbered over four thousand people. There was a very pretty moon that night. It was not at its full, but, I should think, in its second quarter, and as the bonfire died down, that crowd of excited faces, with the building looming up against the sky, took on a weird aspect in the moonlight, which is as vivid to me to-day as it was over fifty years ago.

It was, perhaps, eight o'clock when we began to break in, the sixty-two girls, together with the Lady Superior and servants, having escaped from the building. The first thing that was done, after getting in, was to throw the pianos, of which nine were found, out of the windows. The mob crowded in in such numbers that it was with great difficulty that I got upstairs to the chapel, which was located on the second floor. When I finally succeeded in forcing my way into the chapel I found a fire about the size of a bushel-basket blazing merrily in the middle of the floor. It was made of paper, old books, and such other inflammable stuff as they could lay their hands on, and soon spread in all directions. When the main building was enveloped in flames we went for the cook-house and ice-house, which were separate buildings, and set them on fire.

At a little distance from the main building stood what was called the Bishop's lodge, where he had a library, and where he used to keep his robes, etc. After the ice-house was fired I started for this lodge, and was the first to get in. I picked up a heavy desk and was giving it a swing to heave it out of the win-

dow, when the mob arrived, and not knowing I was within, smashed the glass. The broken pieces were thrown violently into my face, cutting many bad gashes, from which the blood flowed freely. However, I wiped my face, and getting out the Bishop's robe, put it on in a spirit of deviltry. The others stripped it off my back, and winding the remnants around poles, used them as torches, lighting them at the main building and firing the lodge with them. The farm-house and barn were burned next, after which the tomb was visited to see if the body of the music teacher Mary St. John was there. The door of the tomb was broken open, and within was the body of a young girl who had evidently been dead but a day or two at most, and whom I religiously believe to this day to have been Mary St. John, although I had no positive proof of her identity. This finished the events on the hill, and after watching the flames for a while, the immense mob slowly dispersed.

On Thursday, August 14, three days after the destruction of the nunnery, I was arrested by Deputy Sheriff Coleman and taken before a justice for a preliminary examination. Two days were consumed in this examination, and at its conclusion I was sent to Cambridge jail without bail, to await the action of the Grand Jury. About one hundred others were arrested at the same time I was, but only twelve beside myself were ever indicted. As fears were entertained that I might be rescued, I was taken to old Concord, where I remained in jail until court convened—in November, I think. At that time two indictments were found against me, after four days had been spent in examining witnesses, one for arson and one for burglary, both hanging offenses in those days.

I was tried in East Cambridge before Judges Marcus, Morton, Shaw and True. My counsel was Samuel Wheeler and another lawyer, whose name I have forgotten. The trial lasted ten days, and during the whole time the court room was crowded to its utmost capacity by men and women, while hundreds were turned

away every day. The interest was the greater because I was tried as principal, while all the others were either accessories or indicted for minor offenses. The testimony against me was point blank and sufficient to have convicted twenty men, but somehow I proved an alibi, and the jury brought in a verdict of not guilty, after having been out for twenty-one hours.

When the verdict was announced such a shout went up as I never heard even in a New Hampshire town meeting. So beside themselves were the spectators that several were fined by the court before order could be restored. Standing at the door were three mounted horsemen who, the instant the verdict was rendered, started on the gallop, one for West Cambridge, one for Boston, and the third for Charlestown, each swinging his hat and shouting, "Not guilty," "Not guilty."

The streets were lined with people, and the news of the couriers was received with wild huzzas and cheers. I afterwards learned that plans had been carefully laid for my rescue from jail had I been convicted, but I knew nothing of it until after my acquittal, and the twenty-one hours while that jury were thus out were the most solemn of my life.

I was detained by my counsel until five others had been tried, as it was thought I might be needed as a witness, but I was not called upon. These five were acquitted, and the trials of five others were put over until the following June, when all were acquitted but one. That one was Marvin Massey, who was sentenced to State Prison for life, but who was pardoned, after serving a few months, by Judge Morton, who had meanwhile been elected governor.

I was down at Charlestown last summer and all over the old nunnery grounds, which are just as the fire left them, except that the old foundations and ruins have settled down and been overgrown in the intervening years. The old brickyards are gone, and handsome buildings occupy their sites, but I can only think of it as it used to be fifty years ago, when every spot and

corner was as familiar to me as the faces of my friends. Of those who were with me on that night I can give you but little information. One is still living in this town, and another died here a few years ago. The others have slipped away from me, one at a time, and I have about lost sight of them all.

ALASKA IN 1779

NARRATIVE OF A VOYAGE THERE BY FATHER JOHN RIOBO, O.S.F.

For many years there has reposed unnoticed in the library of Santa Clara University, California, the manuscript report of a Franciscan missionary to his Superior, detailing a voyage to Alaska, made in 1779. It is in Spanish, in a beautifully clear script, and is bound up in a volume with other important documents of that time. Recently the President of Santa Clara University, the Rev. Walter F. Thornton, S.J., made a translation of this interesting old story, and we are indebted to him for a copy of his English version, which he assures us has been made with faithful adherence to the original text of this document of special historical value.—ED. RECORDS AND STUDIES.

An account of the voyage made by Father John Riobo, as chaplain of His Majesty's frigates La Princesa and La Favorita to discover new lands and seas north of the settlements of the ports of Monterey and of our Father, San Francisco, whose missions are in charge of the apostolic missionaries of the College of San Francisco of Mexico.

In the frigate called the Princesa, Naval Lieutenant Don Ignatius Artega of the royal armada went as commandant of the expedition, Lieutenant Don Fernando Quiros y Miranda of the royal armada being second in command.

The captain of the other frigate, the Favorita, was a lieutenant of the same rank, Don Juan Francis de la Bodega y Cuadra. This last ship carried 107 men on the roll and supplies for fifteen months, and the Princesa a crew of 98 men with food for thirteen months. Both of them had a supply of water for seven months.

On the eleventh of February, 1779, we left the port of San

Blas at about midnight, sailing to windward and casting anchor near the coast with light land breezes. On the twenty-fifth we decided to depart southward from Maria's islands, unable, as we were, to make headway toward the north. On the twenty-sixth we doubled the islands, and we still had winds from the fourth quarter blowing from the northwest. We lost always in latitude until the fifth of March. The winds then began to vary from north to northwest. We had reached at that time 19 degrees, 47 minutes, north latitude, and 8 degrees, 21 minutes west of the meridian of San Blas. [Note that the meridian is taken from San Blas. This will account for the longitude in the narrative.—*Translator's note.*]

With winds blowing in the same direction we crossed the tropic on the seventeenth of March. As soon as we left the torrid zone the winds became very strong, so that we were obliged to lie to several times, reefed sometimes with mainsail or foresail; sometimes with staysail. On the fourth day of April the winds began to change toward the second quarter. During that night a northeast wind rushed in upon us with great fury, and the frigate was tossed about violently. Nothing remained in place, not even the medicine chest. Notwithstanding its great weight, it was thrown about and the greater part of its syrups, necessary oils and medicines were lost.

We continued without further incident until the nineteenth, and reached about the forty-first degree of latitude and the thirty-seventh of longitude when we were assailed by a fierce southeastern storm. The hurricane raged all night, and we ran with the foresail only, as we feared to carry more sail. On the twentieth we lost sight of the Favorita, till then our inseparable companion.

On the morning of the same day I went with the commandant to the quarter deck, and in the name of all the crew on the frigate he made a vow to Our Lady of the Rosary, patroness of the frigate. He promised the foresail as an offering at her shrine,

and also that he would carry, barefooted, the mast in procession to the church at San Blas if the Blessed Virgin would deliver us from this and other dangers which we might encounter and should we return safely to harbor. As if to reward us for this promise, Our Lady favored us with her powerful protection. Indeed, it would be difficult to find another example of a voyage of discovery fraught with so many dangers and so happily ended.

Henceforth the winds continued as favorable as we could wish, although the rain and cold were annoying. We directed our course toward the harbor of Bucareli. [Bucareli is situated on the southern extremity of Prince of Wales Island, Alaska.—*Translator's note.*] There we arrived on the third of May, and met the Favorita, which had entered at two o'clock in the morning, preceding us by only ten hours after fourteen days of separation. The wind did not allow us to cast anchor near by, but we succeeded in doing so on the east coast in front of a small bay, which we found later to be a fine port, and to which we gave the name of Santa Cruz because we discovered it on Holy Cross day. [This port is on the right hand, near the entrance to the inlet of Bucareli.—*Translator's note.*]

Here again we experienced the care of divine Providence, who guided us. Compelled by the current, and even more by strong gusts of wind, we dropped anchor temporarily in the first suitable spot, intending later to choose a better location. There was not the least suspicion of danger. The next morning, however, at ebb tide we beheld an enormous rock directly in front of the ship. It was scarcely farther from us than the length of the frigate. Undoubtedly we should have been wrecked had we advanced a little farther.

On the sixth of May the two frigates went into safe anchorage within the harbor of Santa Cruz. There were no other incidents worthy of note during the trip so far, other than that the weather was persistently cold and there was much rain. We had also to regret the death of one soldier and a naval gunner.

From the first day we tried to get in touch with the Indians, searching for them among their rancherias. After having hidden their women in the woods, they came to us with signs and tokens of peace, some throwing white feathers into the air from a promontory on the sea, and others standing in a line on the shore with their arms extended in the form of a cross. We gave gifts to each of them, and they, in turn, gave us fish. The fish was of an ordinary kind, a very common species, yet as we were in great need of fresh food we appreciated it highly.

From that day they continued to come to our vessels at all hours, but especially at sunrise and sunset, bringing with them various articles for trading—fish, sleeping mats made of the bark of trees, skins of seal, otter, deer, bear and other animals. They showed us their weapons and even traded us some of them. Their arrows are very finely made; some of them are pointed with flint, some with bone, but most of them have heads of copper and iron.

These Indians have a kind of armor something like that of the ancients with buckler and gorget. They have even protection for their thighs and legs, very skillfully made from pieces of hard wood joined and fastened together with a very strong cord. On their heads they carry the figure of a ferocious beast, rather skillfully carved from wood. They are extremely fond of iron, of which they possess many lances and knives. Their lances are very well made, and are very straight and regular in form, some having a spear head twenty-four inches in length, with a very long, well-made staff. The knives are short, with double cutting edges like a carpenter's plane. They have a great deal of copper and iron, but they are chiefly desirous of obtaining iron, so much so that when they see a piece of barrel hoop they care no longer for glass beads, mirrors, rings or anything else presented to them.

Among these Indians three shades of colors are found; some in complexion and features much resemble Europeans; others have more the appearance of Indians, especially in hair, features

and color; others, again, are just Indians like the rest found in America.

I sang a Mass of thanksgiving ashore on Ascension Day, and some Indians attended. On this occasion I preached a short sermon. In memory of the feast the great guns of the frigates were fired, but the Indians showed no fear. Yet when they first heard the report of the guns on our arrival they betook themselves to precipitate flight.

After paying this homage to the Blessed Virgin, two boats, armed and provided with food for eighteen days, were sent out to survey the bay, which penetrates far inland between mountains covered with fir trees and snow on the northern side. Don Francis Mourelle, the sailing master, who had the rank of ensign on the frigate, and First Mate Don Joseph Camacho, belonging to the armada, together with the second officers of the *Favorite*, Don Juan Bautista de Aguirre and Don Juan Pantoja y Arriaga, took part in the expeditions.

After spending twenty-six days on their reconnoiter—an interval which we made good use of by taking in water, ballast and wood—they returned on the twelfth of June. Their arrival was a great relief to us, as we feared that some mishap had befallen them. Indeed, everything was to be feared, as a very great number of Indians, in more than one hundred canoes, had come to establish themselves in a cove of this harbor. They showed themselves so bold that they stole everything they could, and went so far as to cast down the cross erected on the occasion of the thanksgiving ceremonies in order to obtain the nails.

The men brought back with them a map they made of the bay and of the coast. The work was done thoroughly and is of great importance. [A copy of this may be found at the University of Santa Clara. It is inscribed: "Plans of the inlet of Bucareli. Lat. 55 degrees, 19 minutes, N. long. 27 degrees and 9 minutes W. from Cape San Lucas. Discovered in 1775 with the *Ionora* by Don Juan Francisco de la Quadra and Don Francisco

Antonio Mourelle, and minutely examined in the expedition of 1779 by the same and other officers. From a Spanish Ms. communicated by John Henry Cox, Esq. To whom this plate is inscribed by his most obliged Dalrymple."—*Translator's note.*]

We find that the place in which we now are is rather an arm of the sea than a bay. It contains ten harbors, each one very safe and sheltered. There is plenty of water, ballast and wood on the shore. A great many bays, numberless islands and further on several arms of the sea penetrate deeply into the land. These run to the north, east, northeast and northwest further than we were able to observe.

The Indians robbed them of many necessary articles whenever they had an opportunity. They frequently attacked them, defied them to fight and kept them ever on the watch, day and night. The men did not wish to harm them, but as the Indians became more bold every moment, scorned their arms and boasted frequently of their own power they were compelled to act. They trained their guns on two of the canoes that were empty and demolished them without injuring the Indians. Finally they caught one of them who was more audacious than the rest, and after whipping him with rods for a few moments let him go. After this they were not troubled.

On the thirteenth of June the crew went to wash their clothes on the shore opposite that which was occupied by the Indians, and with whom, after the unfortunate experience of the boats, we began again to treat freely.

On leaving two sailors of the *Favorite* were missing. Our men turned back to look for them, but as they did not appear, an Indian of some authority among them was held as a prisoner. Once on board he was made to understand that if he was kept a prisoner it was merely because two of our men were missing, and that he should tell his people to bring them back. He shouted and a canoe arrived. After having spoken with the

Indians in it he told us that the seamen were in the Indian settlement, and that at sunrise they would bring them back.

This they did not do. They brought only one in a canoe, and stopped far from the frigates. The man was well hidden, and as soon as they uncovered him we told him to come aboard. He answered that they would not allow him to. We could see that the Indians took away an oar which he had seized in order to row to us. They took him back to their hamlet, shouting fiercely. The Indian on board was much vexed that they did not keep their promise. We were much troubled at this incident, and we thought it sufficient reason for breaking off with the Indians and recovering by force the two seamen. However, we pitied the poor Indians, and resolved to try other means. We determined, therefore, to capture more of them in order that a greater number might make an exchange possible.

For this purpose we managed to have an old Indian come to our frigate, but he was a little suspicious, and went back, saying that he would wait in his own canoe until it was boarded by our pilot's mate. This man was advised to go, but to make good his escape and to enter our boat at the first opportunity.

The Indians, however, were very shrewd, and noticing that their old man was not coming back, and that the pilot's mate was very eager to leave them and get into our boat, they seized him by force and tried to head their canoes for the shore.

In order to scare them three or four musket shots were fired, and at the same instant the *Favorite* began to shoot. Being afraid, the natives began to row very rapidly, but their canoes collided and some of them capsized.

Immediately our boats went to the help of the drowning Indians. None was lost. In all we picked up about a score of them. We brought them aboard and gave them plenty to eat. They surely ate splendidly. After giving them presents of cloth to cover themselves, we made them understand that all this had been done merely because we wanted back our two men. We

assured them that we wished to be their friends, but that we must have our two men back. They took leave of us with the best signs of friendship, our boats conveying them to the Indian settlement to make the exchange.

It was effected in the following manner: They gave one of our seamen for the old Indian, who spent the night on board the Favorita, and the other missing man for all the crowd of captives. They were a little reluctant to do this because the latter sailor was held in a different settlement. We were very glad to receive our men again, but they confessed that they had deserted of their own accord. By nightfall they were already penitent, for notwithstanding the good reception made them by the Indians, they were left almost nude. They were not allowed to close their eyes. The captain ordered them punished for their desertion as well as for the amount of trouble to the expedition. They were tied to a gun and given one hundred lashes.

We found afterwards, and it grieved us very much, that an Indian had been killed by a gunshot, and by the thought that perhaps some others had been drowned, although none was to be seen. But it was necessary that they should know the superiority of our arms in order that we should not be obliged to kill a greater number of them if they tried to attack us. Also they should understand that our great and continuous patience with their many thefts did not come from fear.

On the evening of that day the Indians left and on the fifteenth we sailed to pursue our course, but contrary winds obliged us to enter the harbor of San Antonio, which lies on the opposite side of Santa Cruz. Although we tried to do so twice, we were not able to depart until the tenth of July. We took leave, not without much regret, of the Indians who had come to settle there in order to be near us.

During the fifty-eight days we spent in Bucareli, only ten or twelve were clear. The rest of the time the weather was bad—winds, fogs and rains as in the severest winter. The greater

part of the country is rocky and the arable land, which is scarce, is covered with very tall fir trees even down to the shore. We found there also a variety of flowering plants and among them a certain herb or seed very like the common rye, both as to the leaves and the product.

So great is the eagerness of the Indians for iron that even the women carry a little knife hanging to their necks, with which they carve from wood trays of different shapes, very beautifully made. These women have fine features and some are exceedingly white, but all made themselves hideous by a little tablet, two fingers wide, which they carry on the under lip. There is a horizontal incision for that purpose, and they insert the wooden tablet through the opening until it rests against the teeth. It is considered a distinctive mark of married women. The unmarried women have only an incision in the lip, from which they hang a small stick or a copper needle. They have many ornaments made of this metal. The women are all very warlike and full of scars, due, according to their own report, to stabs with knives.

We had the pleasure of bringing back with us three little boys and two little girls who were abandoned by the Indians and exchanged for iron, glass beads and clothes. The youngest of these was brought aboard to my companion, Father Mathias, one evening while I was on land visiting the sick in the barracks. She was very sick and weak. With great care, however, she was soon out of danger. She was baptized the next day because she was in great danger of dying. Her godfather was the commandant. Another very little girl was baptized also on the day of the Mass of thanksgiving because the canoe in which she came with her mother capsized. She was taken half drowned from the water, and although she was baptized and she soon recovered, she was so young that she was given back to her mother.

On the first of July we succeeded in clearing the entrance of Bucareli, which is situated in 55 degrees and 18 minutes north

latitude and 32 degrees of longitude. On account of the winds we went southward, reaching the 53d degree. With a favorable wind we started north again and the same day was sighted land at 58 degrees and 30 minutes, but the wind prevented us from exploring it. The weather continued at that time very dark and foggy until the sixteenth day of July, when with a favorable wind and clear sky we continued our journey north of the 59th degree. The shore is high above the sea level and entirely covered with snow down to the sea. We distinguished some very high mountains which rose above the clouds, particularly one, which can compete with the most famous peaks known anywhere.

On the seventeenth of July we were able to see Cape St. Elias, situated in the 60th degree of latitude and the 43d degree of longitude, a position very different from the one it has on the Russian map. We saw also the island immediately opposite, and to which the commandant gave the name of Carmel because it was discovered on the day dedicated to Our Lady of Mount Carmel. [Probably Middleton Island.—*Translator's note.*]

The winds were moderate and it took us till the twenty-first to cross the large bay which forms a coast in that place. On the evening of the twentieth of July, having mounted to the quarter-deck, as I was about to sit down on the so-called patience bench I fainted and remained senseless for some time. The commandant and the surgeon hurried to my assistance, and with the remedies given by them I entirely recovered. Perhaps it was an effect of sleeplessness, because for ten days I was not able to close my eyes. On the twenty-first of the same month we arrived at a large harbor in the same direction as the passage we were seeking. We called it St. James the Apostle because at that time we were celebrating the novena of the saint, and also because, as the patron of Spain, he should be also the patron of the last land belonging to Spain. We took possession of this harbor in the name of the king. It is situated in 60 degrees 13 minutes north

latitude and 45 degrees 30 minutes longitude. [This was probably Prince William's Sound.—*Translator's note.*]

The island which lies in that harbor we called St. Mary Magdalen. Our first mate, with the rank of ensign of the frigate, and the second officer, sailed in a boat to find if there was any passage in the northerly direction toward the west of the island in the direction of the coast. They came back announcing that the coast ran from the south as a prolongation from the Cape of St. Elias with very high lands covered with snow.

We decided on account of this report to follow the coast in order to see whether the passage could be found farther north. We treated with Indians who met us three miles out at sea in several canoes of a very peculiar construction. These canoes are made with curved forms covered with a strong skin, very well and tightly sewn. They have only one or two holes, like the mouth of an earthen jar, and in each an Indian takes his place. When the two occupants are in their seats the canoes are so tightly closed that it is impossible even in a rough sea for anything inside to get wet.

At first sight in the distance we thought that there were many Indians approaching, but as they came closer we saw that there were only six. They are much fairer of complexion than those at Bucareli and much more curious. They wear a kind of short jacket made of the skins of animals and stitched with a string like that of a guitar and very nicely made. They are ashamed to appear naked, and never do so.

Besides these six in these three canoes, the men of our boat saw about two hundred persons coming in six common but large canoes. They were friendly, but they noticed nothing further. The women had their hair cut short and a string of big beads hanging down to their chest from the corners of their mouth where they were attached. The men carried a bone artistically carved and ornamented on the upper lip. Like the other Indians

they were very much inclined to steal, and they are very cunning in doing it. Just imagine! One day while on board they stole an iron hook belonging to the frigate of such great weight that it would seem incredible. The next day, however, the very Indian who had taken it avowed the theft as soon as he was caught, but we were not able to have it back because we sailed the same day.

In this bay there are many fish of fine quality. The forests, however, belong to the same species and there are extensive fields of green grass.

On the twenty-eighth day of July we sailed, and from the twenty-ninth we began to experience very threatening, cloudy weather, terrible rains and strong winds from the first quarter. The winds soon became hurricanes, and the days were made up of raging storms. There was the greatest fear of shipwreck, surrounded as we were by islands and great rocks in the vicinity of the coast which from time to time we could glimpse through the breaks in the clouds. In such dangers we spent almost a day and night without proceeding because we could not go ahead for fear of striking against the rocky coast.

On the thirty-first of July and the first of August we continued to windward, in and out among numberless islands, almost always with the same danger and identical weather. The storm did not allow us to escape either on one side or the other. In this extremity the commandant resolved to cast anchor near an island which we discovered at the port side of the ship. We succeeded in doing this safely with the two frigates at nine o'clock on the second day of August—a day memorable in our religious Order. We took possession for the second time in the name of the king in a bay not far from there and gave it the name of Our Lady de Regla.

On the third day of August we drew a map of the place, and we found that the coast ran from west to south. We took our position and found that we were at 39 degrees and 8 minutes

north latitude and 49 degrees longitude. We did not discover any Indians near by, but in the distance we could see them. These Indians seemed well favored in comparison with those on the lands seen by us thus far. Although there is little wood and few forests on the shores, they have plenty of water and a great deal of grass. Many flowers were in bloom and the landscape appeared beautiful, beyond measure, showing the fertility of the soil.

On account of the advanced season the commandant decided on the return voyage. Moreover, we had not found the passage we were seeking. We were unable to proceed further north, owing to the foggy weather conditions, as we were continually running into one storm after another. Besides we had already lost seven men by sickness and several attacked by scurvy were dangerously ill.

As soon as we had a favorable wind, which came on the eighth of August, we sailed for the Mendocino cape, which we sighted on the south or southeast until the twenty-second of August, which forced us again higher than the 34th degree of latitude and the 33d degree of longitude, we finally found a favorable wind which brought us to the Mendocino cape. We were becalmed for eight days. Then, without further incident, on the fifteenth of September we entered the harbor of our Father, St. Francis.

In the Presidio they provided barracks for the sick seamen of both frigates, and likewise places for the pilots who had to finish their maps and sketches of the coast and the discovered lands. We presented the Mission church a beautiful picture of the Virgin de los Remeidos, which the captain of the Favorita, Don Juan Francisco de Cuadra y Bodega, had vowed to Our Lady.

This presentation was made with great solemnity. In a procession, accompanied by all the officers, captains and Fathers of

the Mission, we carried it and deposited it in the Church of the Mission of our Father St. Francis.

A high Mass was sung with all solemnity. Salvos of artillery were fired and there was music in thanksgiving for our happy return. After paying this tribute to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the pilots continued their work on the maps and sketches until the thirteenth of September and then we sailed for San Blas.

[Inquiry has been made at the Mission Dolores concerning the painting described, but neither it nor any of the early pictures of the Mission are to be found.—*Translator's Note.*]

PIERRE TOUSSAINT, A CATHOLIC UNCLE TOM

By HENRY BINSSE

One afternoon about half a century ago an inquisitive little boy rummaging in his father's library came across a little book, which displayed, facing the title page, as he opened it, the likeness of a full-blooded African. With a childish remark the boy held up the booklet to his father. An expression of great feeling passed over the father's countenance. "Be very careful of that book," he said. "Do not injure or lose it. It is the life of one of the noblest of men; a man who fulfilled the ideal of a saint more perfectly, more completely than anyone I have ever known."

During the first half of the past century Pierre Toussaint, a negro, in his youth a slave, occupied a position in New York such as no other of his race ever held in the city; and it was all the more remarkable that this consideration should have been given to him, because the lot of the colored people was a pitiable one in those days. Although New York State abolished slavery in 1799, freedom brought with it little to make it worth while. There was not a semblance even of equal opportunity. All occupations were closed to the blacks but menial labor and domestic service. By law they were excluded from stage coaches, travel by rail was allowed only in special cars, which were little better than those used for cattle. They could hold no title to real estate, and in other ways they were treated with an inhumanity which at present it is hard for us to understand. Towards Toussaint the difference of sentiment was amazing. For fifty years and more he continued to be not only the fashionable hairdresser, but for more than that he was deeply respected and greatly beloved in every walk of life.

In those years his trade—it was almost a profession—was of

some consequence. The wave of revolt against autocratic government, which began to rise about the period of our Revolution, influenced many friends of liberty to discard the wig, the symbol of everything artificial in life, which since the reign of Louis XIII had been a ruling fashion. Nevertheless, while the fair sex bravely wore their own locks, or as nearly their own as it might be, much attention and care were given still to dressing the hair in modes deemed attractive and becoming. Those who have read the sentimental novels of the period may recall the heroine always wearing a lily or a rose in her hair. So hair-dressing was truly a minor art, which demanded deft fingers, imagination, tact and a little of the feeling of the artist. Ladies of wealth had their hair dressed every day, and the barber was very well paid.

In the beginning of his career, Pierre Toussaint won the hearts of the people of New York not by his professional skill, but by the romance of his devotion to Madame Bérard. In 1787 John Bérard de Pithou came to New York from the island of Haiti with his wife and her two sisters, seeking a place of shelter from the advancing tempests of the French Revolution. Even then the signs of that fearful political and social upheaval were plainly to be seen. Mr. Bérard thought that the storm would pass over in due time; in a year he expected to go back to the island. For several generations the Bérards had cultivated their plantations near St. Mark, on the west coast of Haiti, a garden spot of the earth. They brought with them five house servants, slaves, among whom were Pierre Toussaint and his sister Rosalie.

When towards the close of the seventeenth century Haiti was ceded to France negro slavery had been established there for some time. The hatred of slavery, which we all bear today, has been of slow growth. In the eighteenth century negro slavery was so universal that it was accepted generally as something according to nature. In fact, many good people viewed it

as a means for teaching Christianity to the subject races, and therefore justifiable. In Africa the negro had nothing which he could call his own; his life and property depended upon the good-will of the chief; frequently they were cannibals and human sacrifices were usual. It was asked, is it not better for these unfortunate beings to be slaves and Christians?

The Bérards were in the first years of married life, and all that the world could give seemed to be their portion. With their wealth they had the traditions of refinement of thought and manner, by which France had made of life a delicate and delightful art. The lot of the Bérard house servants was not unhappy. The bonds of slavery brought to many Catholic slave owners the conviction of a duty: the spiritual as well as the material welfare of their dependents, and therefore the slaves were held by them in deep affection as humble members of the family. Toussaint was dear to his master above the rest. The Bérards had reposed so much confidence in his grandmother, Zénobie, that they had chosen her to accompany John Bérard, his brother and sisters when sent to France for their education. Pierre was a young man then; he was very animated, passionately fond of music and dancing and devoted to Madame Bérard, who was all life and gaiety, ever busy planning social pleasures. Madame Bérard met a hairdresser in New York who pleased her greatly, and she made an arrangement to have him teach his art to Pierre.

As the news from Haiti was disquieting Mr. Bérard decided to go back there, and before leaving placed all the money he had with a firm of New York merchants. Madame Bérard next received letters from her husband saying that there was no hope of saving their property in Haiti and in a little while there came a notice of his death. Shortly afterwards she was left penniless by the failure of the New York merchants to whom her property had been entrusted. Madame Bérard, to support herself, one day gave Pierre some jewels to be sold, but later he came to her with

two packages; in one were the jewels and in the other forty dollars in money. He explained that this sum was partly his earnings by hairdressing and in part his savings. From that day the warm-hearted negro took upon himself to keep her from want and to make her sorrows lighter. Toussaint understood well that Madame Bérard, having been used to society all her life, the excitement of it was necessary to her. When she received an invitation he did everything in his power to raise her spirits and to induce her to accept it. It was his constant study to shield her from despondency. Care and sorrow wore upon Madame Bérard's delicate constitution. She contracted a disease of the throat. A few days before her death she said to Pierre: "My dear Toussaint, I thank you for all you have done for me; I cannot reward you, but God will. You have been everything to me. There is no earthly payment for such service."

After Madame Bérard's death Pierre quickly became a prominent social factor. "The Echoes of a Belle," a fashionable novel of the hour, gives a sketch of his appearance, after dwelling upon his importance to the successful débutante for her entrance into society: "He entered with his good-tempered face, small earrings and white teeth, a snowy apron attached to his shoulders and enveloping his tall, active and graceful figure." It was not merely his skill which endeared Pierre to his many friends. He had the happy art of making everyone love him by an affectionate and gentle manner. He was always the same, simple, at his ease, gentle and courtly. The most unaffected gaiety and good humor at all times, the most respectful and polite bearing, with no trace of servility. With this grace of manner he possessed a lively, ready and perfectly natural conversation. A highly cultivated woman, distinguished for the refinement of her taste, said of him: "Some of the pleasantest hours I pass are in conversation with Toussaint, while he is dressing my hair. I anticipate it as a daily recreation." Children adored him and looked forward with delight to the treat of having him

cut their hair. He never spoke of anything seen or heard in the homes of his friends, observing perfect discretion in these matters, and when he was pressed sometimes by a prying question he stopped the overcurious one politely but firmly.

Once, when a lady in conversation with a person of great discrimination, had named the Minister of France to the United States, Hyde de Neuville, as her ideal of a perfect gentleman, her friend replied: "The most perfect gentleman I have ever met is Pierre Toussaint."

In one of his delightful *Causeries*, so full of interesting history, *Sainte Beuve* relates that, "The Introduction to a Devout Life" of St. Francis de Sales touched the heart of the French people deeper than any spiritual book had done previously. It became the fashion to have the book on the table and to talk it over in every day conversation. The idea of sanctifying the little things of everyone's daily life made a strong appeal to the French imagination. Accepting the sweet, gentle, simple admonitions of St. Francis, many families in France cultivated good manners and conversation with the greatest care, understanding by good manners those inspired by charity and courtesy, the hand-maiden of charity; and by conversation not a monologue no matter how brilliant, but the happy interchange of ideas, the search for the amusing side of the petty annoyances of daily life, expression of sympathy with, and interest in, the joys and sorrows of others, efforts to be light-hearted and cheerful oneself, and to make others equally so. Aggressiveness, personalities, sharp words, ridicule, grievances, all these sins of conversation were forbidden.

While undoubtedly this was the atmosphere in which Pierre grew up, the perfection reached by him in manners and conversation was due in part to an unusually intelligent mind and an amiable, affectionate heart, but chiefly to a life of abounding charity and a high degree of spirituality.

Pierre married Juliette Noël, the daughter of a slave, who

had been brought from the West Indies to New York as a nurse by a French family. They were devoted to each other. "I would not exchange my Juliette for all the ladies in the world. She is beautiful in my eyes," said he to a French friend. Their marriage remained childless, so Pierre adopted Euphemia, the infant daughter of his sister Rosalie. The baby was frail and weak, but by the untiring care of Pierre and his wife she lived and became the centre of Pierre's life. His tender love for his little niece knew no bounds and no instruction for the cultivation of her heart and mind was neglected. He frequently combined lessons in charity with the little girl's pleasures. Toussaint took great interest in the Catholic Orphan Asylum for white children. "On Euphemia's saint's day," he said, "I always took her with me to the cake store and we filled a large basket with buns, jumbles and gingerbread, which we carried to the orphan asylum." The lady to whom Pierre related this inquired: "Did you have her give them to the children?" "O no, madam! That would not be proper for the little black girl. I told her to ask one of the Sisters if she would give them to the children? When they had been sent for Euphemia stood on one side with me to see them come in and receive their cakes."

Toussaint's interest in the orphan asylum ceased only with his death. His executors found the money and account of a collection which he had been engaged in making for the orphans just before his last illness.

Euphemia's health began to fail as she grew to womanhood. Pierre hung over the adored child with an intensity of love which endangered his life. His friend, the Rev. Doctor Power, rector of St. Peter's in Barclay Street, did all he could to prepare Pierre for the coming loss, and Pierre became more resigned. He said one day: "God is good; we know it here on earth; but my Euphemia will know it first in heaven."

In a few months his beloved child passed away. For a long time he could only say to those who came to comfort him:

"My poor Euphemia is gone!" covering his face with his hands. He grew thin, avoided society and refused to be comforted; but his spiritual vision was too clear for him to give way altogether under this trial. After many severe struggles, he regained self-command and took up again his usual way of life. The effect of this deep wound in his heart was to increase the time he gave to his good works.

After Toussaint's death his executors found a trunk full of letters* and papers, all having reference in one way or another to his numberless charities. There are papers of manumission of slaves whom he freed before the New York State emancipation act. There are many letters from colored people whom he was continually assisting. It was his habit to select a promising negro boy, charging himself with the lad's education, and having him taught a trade later on. There are letters from Mr. Bérard, the brother of his late master, and his sisters, who were living in poverty in France, thanking Pierre for beautiful presents he had made to them. Most interesting are letters from priests. One writes from Rome that he has completed his studies by Toussaint's assistance and has been ordained. He expresses his gratitude with much feeling. There is a long, pathetic letter from a very poor, sick priest, in a Canadian seminary, who tells of his fear of the approaching winter, as he has no warm clothing of any kind. A priest sends a long report of the failure of a mission to Haiti, on account of interference by the civil authorities. Evidently the money for this mission was furnished by Toussaint.

There was found after his death among his effects a metal crucifix to the back of which were fastened slips of paper with the words: "To Toussaint from a grateful priest."

Pierre was an excellent nurse and gave much time to the sick. One day he heard that a priest was abandoned in a garret

* Miss Georgine Schuyler presented all Toussaint's papers to the New York Public Library.

very ill from ship fever and destitute. He removed the priest to his home, where with Juliette's help the sick man was brought back to health. During an outbreak of yellow fever, not an unusual epidemic in those days of bad sanitation, the disease appeared in Maiden Lane. Everyone fled from the street. Pierre, learning that a woman had been left to die in one of the abandoned houses, fearlessly went to the patient and took care of her, returning daily until her recovery.

A friend who knew Pierre well* wrote to the *Home Journal* after Toussaint's death: "His days and nights were given to visits and ministrations to the sick, attendance upon the bereaved, attempts to reform the erring, and to the consolation of the afflicted."

His good works were often accompanied by great delicacy. A once rich French gentleman whom he had known lost his money and fell very ill. For his recovery good, nourishing food was required. For several months Toussaint and Juliette sent to him daily a well cooked dinner in such a manner that he never suspected from whom it came. "If he had known," explained Toussaint, "he might not have liked it."

A French lady became financially embarrassed by the failure of her property to make returns, so she consulted Toussaint about some employment. He suggested teaching French. She said frankly that she knew no grammar. "Madam, I am no judge," said he, "but I have frequently heard it said that you speak unusually pure and correct French. Would you be willing to give lessons in conversation?" She gave her consent, and at once he set about securing scholars for her. He was so successful that she was able to support herself and her family until a change of affairs brought back her former income.

His zeal for the Church was endless. In 1839 Monsieur de Forbin-Jasson, Bishop of Nancy and Toul and Primate of

* Mr. Henry T. Tuckerman, a well-known writer.

Lorraine, came to New York on his way to give missions to the French Catholics of the United States and Canada. After preaching for some time in Louisiana he came back to New York in 1841. While stopping with the writer's grandfather it was suggested that the Bishop should say Mass at St. Peter's and announce in the daily papers that he would preach in French. The church was crowded, and so many went to the sacristy after the service to thank him that he saw the attendance would seem to warrant a church for the French, and he asked for subscriptions. The first was from Pierre, for one hundred dollars. This was the beginning of the Church of St. Vincent de Paul.

Pierre, twenty years older than Juliette, never thought he would outlive her, and Juliette's death was a blow from which he never recovered. He kept saying: "It is God's will!" From day to day he lost strength visibly; but still morning after morning even through the cold and snow of winter, his slow and feeble steps took him on his way to Mass, which he had never failed to attend in sixty years, until a few months before his death. Later in the day the aged man, broken by age and sorrow, could be seen going painfully on errands of love and mercy.

In his last illness a dear friend came to see him and finding him with the sun shining full upon his face, she asked if she should close the blind? "O no! Madame," he replied, "for then I should be too black." His position as a negro or as a slave never awakened in him feelings of discontent or self-abasement. He firmly believed that he was a black man by the Divine will, and that he was as much an object of Divine Love as any human being. He was fulfilling his duty in the place where his Heavenly Father had willed to put him; that certainly gave him peace and serenity, with a keen sense of self-respect.

Toussaint reflected deeply and his faith seemed to be enlivened by a quick perception of the truth rather than by reading. He had taught himself many things; he had good taste and a most retentive memory. He would quote pages from Bossuet

and from Massillon—his favorite author.* Quotations from the Sermon on the Mount and maxims from à Kempis were introduced frequently in his conversation. He spoke with pleasure of a teaching which had imprinted itself deeply in his mind. "Jesus can give you nothing so precious as Himself, as His own mind. May this mind be in you! Do not think that any faith can do you good if you do not try to be pure and true like Him."

Miss E. F. Cary of Boston, who became a convert, said of him: "His life was so perfect, and he explained the teaching of the Church with a simplicity so intelligent and so courageous that everyone honored him as a Catholic. He would explain our devotion to the Mother of God with the utmost clearness, or show the union of natural and supernatural gifts in the priests, or quote our great spiritual writers in a way to account best for the faith that he bore. When I was young I used to hear Protestants speak with reverence of two Catholics—the great Fénélon and the humble Toussaint—and it made a great impression on my mind."

He often rented rooms in his home to young men who had come to New York to study or to follow a career. In the most unobtrusive way he would gain their confidence and manage to divert them from the many temptations of the city.

When Toussaint came to New York the free negroes and some Quakers tried to induce him to leave his master. They told him a man's freedom was his own. "Mine," said he, "belongs to my mistress." When the colored people of New York celebrated their emancipation, July 5, 1800, they came to Toussaint, offering him a prominent place in the procession. He thanked them with his habitual politeness, but declined the honor, saying: "I do not owe my freedom to the state, but to my mistress." While he had bought the freedom of others with his

* It must be borne in mind that Bossuet and Massillon are still favorite authors in every devout French household and were much more so before the Revolution. Doubtless he had heard them read very often in his youth.

savings, he did not seek it for himself, although beyond a doubt he could have had it for the asking. On her death bed Madame Bérard remembered that he was still a slave, and she insisted that papers giving him freedom should be made out at once.

With all his depth of feeling, he was without a trace of sentimentality. He was always trying to uplift his own people by inspiring them to lead better lives. He would never discuss the question of emancipation throughout the United States, grasping fully its practical difficulties. Once, when asked whether he was an Abolitionist, he replied: "They have never seen blood flow as I have. They do not know what they are about."

A life-long friend, Mrs. George Lee, tells of her last visit to Pierre, in a letter to her son at college: "When I last saw Pierre I perceived that his days were numbered. He was very feeble, but sitting in an arm chair in his dressing gown and supported by pillows a more perfect representation of a gentleman I have never seen. He was overcome when he saw me, and tears ran from his eyes. 'It is so changed! so changed! so lonely,' he said. He was too weak to converse. I left the city and in early June I received notes from Mrs. George Lee Schuyler, who had visited him daily for months. 'Toussaint was in bed today. He says with his usual delicate humor: '*Il ne peut pas être mieux.*'* He was dreamy and indistinct, but calm, cheerful and placid. He told me he had received the last sacraments and mentioned that two Sisters of Charity had been to see him and had prayed with him. He speaks of the excellent care he has received and said: 'All things are for the best.'"

A few days later Mrs. Schuyler wrote: "Excellent Toussaint! He has gone to those he loved. On Monday, when I entered, he had revived a little and, looking up, he said: 'God is with me.' When I asked him if he wanted anything, he answered with a

* Nothing could be better; which might be taken to refer either to his bed or to his approaching death, a singularly beautiful act of resignation.

smile: 'Nothing on earth!' I did not think he was so near his end, but on Thursday he passed away." (June 30, 1853, in his eighty-seventh year.)

In another letter Mrs. Schuyler says: "I went to town Saturday to attend Toussaint's funeral at St. Peter's. His friend, Father Quinn, made a most interesting address at the Mass. He did not speak of his color and hardly referred to his station; it seemed as though his virtues as a man and a Christian had absorbed all other thoughts. Father Quinn said:

"Though no relative was left to mourn for him, yet many would feel that they had lost one who always had wise counsel for the rich, words of encouragement for the poor and all would be grateful for having known him.' The aid he had given to the late Bishop Fenwick, of Boston, to Father Power of St. Peter's, to all the Catholic institutions was dwelt upon at large. How much I learnt of his charity which I had never heard before! In conclusion Father Quinn said:

"There were few left among the clergy superior to him in zeal and devotion to the Church and for the glory of God; among laymen not one.' "

When Juliette was buried Toussaint asked that none of his white friends should follow her to the grave. His request was remembered now and respected. They stood back as the coffin was borne from the church, but many were gathered around his grave as his body was lowered to its last resting place. He was buried with Juliette and Euphemia in old St. Patrick's Cemetery, Mott Street.

THE CHURCH OF SAINT VINCENT DE PAUL (THE FRENCH CHURCH), NEW YORK

By HENRY BINSSE

To a Catholic the two bewildering features of the French Revolution must be the shocking horror of the impiety and wickedness which suddenly stands revealed among a people up to that time, to all appearance, deeply religious, and then, the almost immediate return of the French people to the old Faith and worship, after it seemed as though the Church had been repudiated for all time. The key to the latter puzzle is given by de Tocqueville: "Taking it all for all, I do not know that there ever was, at any period, a more virtuous, a more distinguished clergy than the priesthood of France, when the storm of revolution arose against them."

Among the noble, heroic souls who brought France back to Christianity there stands prominent, Jean Baptiste Rauzan, founder of the Society of the Missions of France, and after its dissolution the founder of the Society of the Fathers of Mercy. He was born at Bordeaux, December 5, 1757, the eldest son of parents distinguished for piety and virtue, and was ordained in 1782. Therefore, when the Revolution broke out, ten years later, he was in the best years of manhood. By the direction of older priests and of his confessor, who insisted that his unusual gift for preaching should be saved for rebuilding France later on, he escaped to England, disguised as a soldier. Going afterwards to Belgium and to Prussia, everywhere he gave spiritual aid and comfort to the many refugees from his own country. When it became safe to do so, he went back to France, and in 1803 his zeal and eloquence attracted the attention of Cardinal Fesch, who requested him to undertake the

revival of faith throughout France by a series of missions. It was not until after the Restoration (1814), that he was able to collect together a body of priests for this project. Among those who presented themselves for the noble work was Charles-Auguste, the second son of Count de Forbin-Janson, a nobleman of prominence and wealth, (1785-1844.) Refusing many offers of worldly honor and advancement, this young man entered Saint Sulpice and was ordained in 1811. Soon he was made vicar of the diocese of Chambery; but he resigned the office in his zeal for missionary work and was advised by Pius VII to make France the field of his labors. Perhaps it was through his position and influence that the Society of the Missions for France, which he assisted Rauzan to organize, was helped greatly by a society of zealous ladies of fortune and position.

This Society of the Missions met at once with such success in rekindling the fire of faith throughout France that it drew the marked hatred of the enemies of religion; and in the Revolution of 1830 the government hastened to suppress it. Rauzan humbly resigned himself to the will of God, and retired to an obscure parish. In 1834, Gregory XVI encouraged him to resume missionary work, and to found a new Society, to be known as the Fathers of Mercy. His Holiness gave to it the seal of his approval by the sanction of its Constitution and Rule, February 18, 1834. Father Rauzan chose its name to indicate that the chief object of the Society was the consolation of the poor and the afflicted. Their field was not to be limited to that of the missionary; it was to include all the works which glorify the greatest and sweetest of the attributes of Our Saviour, His Divine mercy. Moreover, the Society was placed under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception, that most wonderful mystery of Divine Mercy for which Father Rauzan and his priests always had an especial devotion. The declaration of the dogma took place about twenty years later.

In 1823, de Forbin-Janson was appointed Bishop of Nancy

and Toul; but in 1830 he also became the object of persecution by the government and was forced to leave France. He then went back to the work so near to his heart which had occupied the years before he was called to the episcopacy. After some years in this work the Pope advised him to go as a missionary to the French in America. He sought Father Rauzan and begged permission to take some members of his Society with him. He arrived in New York in 1830, accompanied by two Fathers of Mercy. Their missionary work was first among the descendants of the French in Louisiana and in Canada.

Bishop de Forbin-Janson then returned to New York on February 21, 1841, and, within a few weeks, gave a spiritual retreat for French Catholics in St. Peter's Church, Barclay Street. "In this great city of New York," he said in his final sermon, "where Catholics of Irish and of German birth have hesitated at no sacrifice to secure churches and priests of their own nationality, how is it possible that the French, so famous for the faith of their fathers, should have remained indifferent? They are lacking in interest both for their own salvation and for that of their countrymen. In truth, how can they hope to maintain their traditions on a foreign soil without the strong ties of religion? Such a church is desired most strongly by Bishop Hughes, who expects great things for his diocese from it."

The next day, April 11, a meeting was held and a temporary committee elected for the purpose of founding a French Church, to which it was decided that a free school and a *hospital were to be added later on. John La Farge, on May 2, in the name of the committee, of which he was treasurer, bought the ground on which the ruins of the Protestant Church of the Annunciation, recently burned down, stood, four lots on the north side of Canal street, east of Broadway, for \$28,000, payment being made

*The French Hospital was established later by the French Benevolent Society, a secular association. Its care was given to the Mari-anite Sisters of the Holy Cross, their Chaplain being a Father of Mercy, from the Church of St. Vincent de Paul.

by two loans, one for \$22,000 from Mr. La Farge, and one for \$6,000 from Bishop de Forbin-Janson, who afterwards made a gift of his loan. It was decided that the church should bear the name of one of the greatest of the children of France, St. Vincent de Paul.

Work was begun in August under the direction of Mr. Louis F. Binsse. The cornerstone was laid with much ceremony October 11, 1841, by Mr. de la Forest, Consul-General of France. In March, 1842, the church was incorporated, the board consisting of Louis F. Binsse, president; Claudius Gignoux, treasurer; Alexis Berger, secretary; with Bishop Hughes as honorary president. The completed edifice was dedicated by Bishop Hughes on August 21, 1842, the sermon being preached by the Rev. Dr. Raymond, President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore. The Bishop also made an address in which he said he looked on the dedication of the new church as an epoch in the record of the diocese. He gave it in temporary charge of the Rev. Anthony Deydier, a priest of the diocese of Vincennes then visiting in New York to seek aid for his own mission in the West.

In November, 1842, Bishop Hughes appointed as the pastor of the new church the Rev. Annet Lafont, a Father of Mercy who had been working in the South; and the zeal of this holy missionary for the church of his countrymen in New York was so great that he would never consider any other work. The next years were filled with financial troubles and other difficulties, which as we read about them in the minutes of the parish board of trustees, bring forcibly before our eyes the slender resources and almost crushing trials of the first steps in establishing the congregation. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith was a generous benefactor, presenting 25,000 francs in the first year at Bishop Hughes' request. As a matter of contrast it is interesting to note, that to-day the contribution of the New York diocese to this Society's work is equalled nowhere else.

In the French Church the ceremonies for Corpus Christi, the

First Communion of the children and the great feast days were celebrated in accordance with old Catholic usages, and appeals to devotion, like the Holy Crib at Christmas and the Blessed Sepulchre on Good Friday, were made for the first time. The first Society for the Holy Rosary in New York was established in this church, and on February 5, 1845, the French Charitable Society of the Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul was organized for the relief of the poor by spiritual and corporal acts of mercy and the raising of funds for charities connected with the church. It may be considered as the parent of all the St. Vincent de Paul charities. Among the ladies who for many years were most zealous and to whose devotion these charities owe their success there should be named Madame Binsse and Madame Crooks, later on Madame L. Delmonico, Madame LaMontagne and Madame C. DuVivier.

On taking charge of his parish, Father Lafont was moved by the truly pitiable condition of the Negroes in New York. They had secured but little by their emancipation of half a century previous. They could hold no real estate, were permitted in no public vehicle or place of amusement, when traveling they had to use a special car which was little better than those for cattle, and they suffered many indignities and acts of oppression. Some of these colored people were Catholics from the French West Indies. Father Lafont organized for them the St. Ann Society, the first negro mission in New York. They held weekly meetings under his direction in the basement of the church. Father Lafont gave spiritual instructions to them and to their children. This society was kept up until it was thought advisable to merge it with Father Burke's great mission in the Church of St. Benedict the Moor.

In these years, also, there was established a committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the first in New York. Mr. Louis B. Binsse took an active interest in this committee and was its secretary at the time of his death. Right Rev. Mgr.

Preston was long its president. The committee ceased with the general national organization of the Society in 1897.

Directly after taking charge Father Lafont began a parochial school. It was supported chiefly by the Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul. There was a department for girls, which was under Mlle. Lagarde, a saintly woman, who devoted her life to good works and left all her modest fortune to the church at her death. Father Lafont, realizing that this school was not equal to the needs of the congregation, besought Brother Philip, the Superior-General of the Christian Brothers, to send some Brothers to take charge. The application, which had the warm support of Bishop Hughes, was acted upon favorably, and four Brothers arrived in New York on July 26, 1848. They were Brother Stylien, Director; Brother Andronis, Novice-Master; Brother Albien, Sub-Director, and Brother Pastoris. Their coming was noticed in the press by a witless cartoon and joke, speaking of them as "Jesuits." Father Lafont received them in his home, but in time a building was erected for them. Within six weeks the first novice presented himself and before twelve months had passed they had four novices. On the first Monday in September, 1848, the Brothers took charge of their first school in New York. As the children were of French parentage it did not matter greatly that the Brothers spoke no English; but soon, with their novices, they could teach the English-speaking boys also. In this humble way were laid the foundations of Manhattan College.

Changes in the character of the neighborhood of Canal Street in the succeeding decade made it evident that a new site further up town would have to be secured for the church, and accordingly a plot of ground in West Twenty-third Street near Sixth Avenue was purchased in 1857. The cornerstone of the new church was laid by Archbishop Hughes on June 14, 1857, and the edifice was completed at a cost of about \$85,000 under direction of a building committee made up of Claude Ligneaux, Victor Durand, Laville Duberican, L. N. d'Homege, M. de

Comeau, L. Boquet and John Milhai. It was dedicated by Archbishop McCloskey on May 9, 1868. The property in Canal Street was sold and the proceeds devoted to the building fund of the new structure. The old church was used for a short time by the Rev. A. Sanguinetti for an Italian congregation and then torn down and commercial buildings put up on the site.

In 1876 the house in which the rectory was located was torn down and the present more comfortable and appropriate residence was built. In the same year the fine parochial school was erected.

Having provided for the spiritual needs of the children who were blessed with parents and homes, Father Lafont began to plan for the unfortunate little ones who were without this love and care and were thrown helpless upon the world. With the best of will, Father Lafont could do little by himself, for the pressing duties of his parish took all his time. He found the desired help in Madame Emilie Crooks, a zealous member of the Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul. In February, 1858, he suggested that, as the congregation would soon occupy the new church of St. Vincent de Paul in Twenty-third Street, this was the moment to give particular attention to the young orphans. In March Madame Crooks was unanimously elected the head of the little asylum and the first orphans were received in May and placed under the charge of Mademoiselle Lagarde.

In 1861 a little house was rented for their use at 146 West Twenty-sixth Street, and the work having grown beyond the ability of the ladies, they called to their assistance the Marianite Sisters of the Holy Cross. In 1868, the asylum having outgrown its modest home, the property at 215 West Thirty-ninth Street was acquired, the asylum was incorporated and a board of management elected. In 1886 the present asylum was completed. The number of the children increased until at one time the asylum found itself in the direst necessity. Father Aubril, the successor of Father Lafont, in great distress, went to his

Eminence, Cardinal McCloskey, and laid the situation before him. At once the Cardinal presented Father Aubril with his check for \$1,000, at the same time granting to the Sisters the privilege of asking for alms for their institution. Since that day the asylum has flourished.

The orphans having been provided for, Father Aubril inspired the zealous Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul to establish a day nursery for the children of mothers who have to support themselves. In 1887 a house was bought on South Washington Square, and under its roof there was soon a tiny chapel, a school, a nursery and the home of the capable Sisters of the Holy Cross. In a few years this became too small and it was enlarged by the purchase of the house next door. Every day this institution takes care of thirty babies and three hundred children on an average. Not only are their temporal wants filled, but, what is more important, their tiny souls are opened to the knowledge of their Creator. As the Day Nursery grew larger it became apparent that for the sake of the health of the Sisters, quite as much as for the children, a summer home was a necessity. From this came the Villa St. Vincent de Paul, at Sea Cliff, L. I., which holds a little chapel and a home for the chaplain, with accommodations for sixty children and rooms for the Sisters.

A young girl who had experienced the loneliness and the dangers which try young women who come to New York to earn their living suggested the foundation of still another charity, a home for French girls alone in New York. A house was given for this purpose by a devoted friend of the parish, and a little colony of twelve was established in 1896. Twelve years later the Jeanne d'Arc Home, in West Twenty-fourth Street, was confided to the care of the Sisters of Divine Providence. Two more houses were bought as greater demands were made upon the Home; and, finally, a six-story building was erected on the three lots, with room for one hundred and thirty young girls.

The Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul had long regretted their

inability to succor in an acceptable way the worthy, aged poor. They now undertook to do something for the old people; and this led to the establishment of the Home of Divine Providence at Grassmere, L. I., a property with seven acres of ground, under the care of the Sisters of Divine Providence, a home for twenty-three old folks, who pass their time in work in their rooms and about the Home, in regular daily common prayer and visits to the Blessed Sacrament. Here, in quiet and peace, they prepare for the next world.

For some years it was customary to take the orphans, in Summer, for a breath of salt air to Coney Island; but as the objections to this increased it was decided that a change was necessary. A charming Summer home was found at Oceanic, N. J., where in the Villa Ste. Anne there are accommodated sixty children and ten Sisters. This gives to each child in the asylum three weeks' vacation in the country, an incalculable benefit for these poor children.

The Christian Brothers have long since ceased to teach the parish school of St. Vincent de Paul, which is now in charge of the Marianite Sisters.

As a fitting crown to this noble chain of good works, to which it would not be easy to find a parallel, some generous ladies donated to the Church of St. Vincent de Paul one of the most beautiful spots for a church in all New York. For many years it had been the desire of the Very Rev. Father Wucher, the head of the Community, to build a church uptown, the residential section having moved away from West Twenty-third Street. On a site overlooking Morningside Park and all New York, just north of the Protestant Cathedral of St. John the Divine, there is now nearly completed, one of the most perfect creations of architecture in New York, the Church of Notre Dame. Its exterior, in reticent simplicity and in purity of line, possessing that most rare quality, harmony, is a model of beautiful, ecclesiastical art. It is a monument worthy of its location. With

the completion of its dome, the statue of Our Lady will take all New York under its saving protection.

Louis François Binsse was born of a Breton family at Cap Français, Haiti, then a French colony. He was educated at La Fléche, the leading college in France, and accompanied Viscount Donatien Rochambeau, son of the general of our War of Independence, to Haiti as his secretary when Rochambeau was sent by France to subdue the blacks. In the end Rochambeau had to return, unsuccessful; and the whites fled from Haiti, among them Mr. Binsse, who came to New York. He married there Mlle. Victoire Bancel de Confoulens, daughter of one of the "garde du corps" of Louis XVI. As with many others, what they had seen in the first years of the French Revolution had given them a very unusual force of conviction in their Faith.

Father Lafont was wont to say that to Mr. Binsse the credit was due for the establishment of the French Church. Mme. Binsse was equally devoted to the work of the Ladies of St. Vincent de Paul. Their son, Louis B. Binsse, inherited his parents' devotion to Catholic interests. He was the first Trustee elected to the Board of the Emigrants' Industrial Savings Bank, 1851, and was its Secretary, 1853-1866, when he resigned. He was a Trustee of the Cathedral and the Secretary of the Board from 1852 to 1854. For many years he was a Trustee of the Orphan Asylum on Fifth Avenue, at a period when very few laymen were willing to serve.

With little support he fought long and valiantly for the rights of Catholic children, as embodied later in the Freedom of Worship Bill. By focussing public opinion upon the injustice done to Catholic children in our State institutions, he made it easy for others to secure the passage of the Bill later on.

He was a frequent contributor to the *Catholic World*, the *Catholic Review* and other publications on Catholic subjects. At the time of his death, 1895, he was Trustee of the French Church and of the Orphan Asylum, a Director of the Society for

the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (elected in 1884), and Secretary of the Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

He was appointed Consul-General of the Papal States by His Holiness Pope Pius IX, July, 1850, with a brevet title of major. In 1857 he was made a Knight of St. Gregory. In 1879 Leo XIII made him a Knight Commander.

Mme. Emilie Crooks was the wife of Ramsay Crooks, a grandson of the Scotch painter, Allen Ramsay, and an associate with Astor in the foundation of Astoria. He had command of the overland expedition to Astoria, and Washington Irving tells much about him in his history of that enterprise. Mme. Crooks came of a prominent St. Louis family, the Prats, French-Canadians originally. Many of her descendants are to be found today in the New York families of French extraction.

In the Church of St. Vincent de Paul are these tablets, put there by Mr. Louis F. Binsse:

A

la mémoire de

Mgr. Charles Auguste Marie Joseph, Cte. de Forbin-Janson
Evêque de Nancy et de Toul, Primat de Lorraine, qui, lors
de son passage à New York en 1841,

jetta, avec l'aide des laïcs zélés de cette paroisse les
premiers fondements de cette Paroisse Catholique Française
de St. Vincent de Paul, et consacra à cette bonne oeuvre
la somme de \$6500.

Né le 3 Nov. 1785 ; mort le 11 Juillet, 1844.

Zelo, zelatus sum pro Domino Deo Excelso

To

the memory of

Mgr. Charles Auguste Marie Joseph, Count de Forbin-Janson,
Bishop of Nancy and Toul, Primate of Lorraine,
Who, passing through New York in 1841, laid the foundations
for this French Catholic Parish of St. Vincent de Paul,
with the aid of its zealous laymen,
and donated the sum of \$6500 to that purpose.

Born Nov. 3, 1785. Died July 11, 1844.

I was filled with zeal for the Lord Most High

A

la mémoire du

Rd. Annet Lafont S. P. M.

Il fonda cette paroisse dont il fut le premier Recteur
et déclina les honneurs de l'épiscopat plutôt que de la quitter.
Prêtre modèle, il se distingua par son dévouement à ses
ouailles et son grand zèle pour les bonnes œuvres et léguâ
son modeste avoir aux écoles de cette église.

Mort le 5 Janvier, 1875.

usé par les travaux du sacerdoce.

Bonus pastor animam suam dat pro ovibus suis.

To

the memory of the

Reverend Annet Lafont,

The founder of this parish, of which he was the first Rector.
Rather than leave it he declined the honor of the Episcopacy.
A model priest, he excelled in devotion to his flock and in
abounding zeal for good works,
bequeathing his little estate to the schools of the parish.

Died January 5, 1875.

Worn out by his priestly toil.

The Good Shepherd giveth his life for his sheep.

Father Lafont was assisted from time to time by several priests, among whom may be mentioned (1848-1853) the Rev. Anthony Cauvin, founder and for many years rector of the Church of Our Lady of Grace, Hoboken, New Jersey; Rev. N. Madeore (1850-1857); Rev. A. Fourmount (1858); Rev. L. Gambosville (1868-1864); Rev. E. Aubril (1867-1878); Rev. Michael Ronay. The latter, in his zeal for the promotion of Catholic education, opened the College of St. Louis, for which a handsome building was erected in West Forty-second Street in 1873. It enjoyed the patronage of many well-known families, and he continued at its head till his death. Under the direction of Professor Brophy it was kept open for several years after Father Ronay passed away.

OUR DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE HOLY SEE

The following additional note concerning the abolition of the former diplomatic representation of the United States at the Vatican is supplied by one of the members of the Society:

When in the early sixties the successive movements for a united Italy resulted in depriving the Pope of his temporal possessions, and he was shut up in Rome, protected only by French bayonets from further revolutionary outbreaks, there was a discussion in the United States House of Representatives on the question whether an American minister was longer needed at the Papal court. The House voted to discontinue the ministry. From that time for several years attempts were made to reinsert Rome in the list of countries to which American representatives were to be accredited, and in 1870, when the report on the Diplomatic and Consular service came before the House, Mr. Brooks (of New York) made what he termed his annual motion to restore the representation at Rome. Mr. Kelsey opposed the motion on the grounds that the question had been fully discussed and no good reasons appeared for its renewal.

Mr. Brooks declared that Rome had long been a world center morally, religiously and artistically, to which thousands of Americans traveled. The House voted adversely. Mr. Banks renewed the motion, supported by Messrs. Cox and Potter. Mr. Brooks (who in the course of the debate was charged with Know-nothingism) lent some passion to the discussion by alleging that puritanism and bigotry underlaid the opposition. This brought to his feet John A. Bingham, one of the most forceful speakers of the House, and who had been chairman of the House managers of the impeachment proceedings against President Johnson. The feeling roused by the question may be inferred from his

remarks in which he regretted that "the unjust charge" of bigotry had been brought into the debate. He added, in part:

"Rome needs no eulogy at the hands of gentlemen who suppose that that sect supports the Democratic organization. Recent events have shown that that power itself is no longer a unit, and cannot be. The *Syllabus* (of Pius IX) recently uttered is a declaration of principles which the gentleman from New York (Mr. Brooks) dare not indorse and go home among his people. It is an attempt to fetter the freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, an attempt to strike down the rising antagonism to every despotism on the face of the earth, in the form of representative government, foremost among the exponents of which is America, the child and the hope of the world's old age. Talk to me at this era of history, about Rome being the patron of science and mother of the arts! Why, sir, of that genius which makes the marble wear the divine beauty of life there is more today in living America than ever was dreamed of in Rome living or dead. Why talk of dignifying that little principality with a resident minister from America? Do not the gentlemen know that in the light of the teachings of that foremost of all the men bred in the faith of the Church of Rome (and I admit she has bred many great and noble men who knew how to make humanity itself beautiful even amid the terrors and tortures of martyrdom) uttered a word when under the ban of Charles V, and Leo X, and Henry VIII, which reverberates today all over Christendom—I refer to the Augustan monk who proclaimed to mankind the great central truth which today possesses the enlightened mind of the nineteenth century that no mitred head may of the grace of God and divine right interpose its dark shadow between man and his Maker. By that word Luther became the liberator of the human race; it made the immortal period of human history, the refuge, the insurance of the human mind against the despotism which for centuries had enslaved it. Under the omnipotent power of

that utterance every tyrant whether in Rome or out of it holds today the reins of power with a tremulous and unsteady hand; and the day is not far distant when every throne of power shall turn to dust and ashes before the consuming breath of the enlightened opinion of the civilized world which declares for free governments, free churches, free schools, free bibles and free men."

After a repudiation by Mr. Dawes of sectarian motives in opposing the motion, Mr. Voorhees revived the accusation of bigotry, charging that witches and Catholic convents had been burned by Puritans. Mr. Hoar, in reply, explained that Massachusetts had done exemplary penance for the execution of the witches, and that the mob of convent burners had been punished by the authorities of that state. A charge that Protestants had been refused permission by the Papal government to worship in Rome was met with an assertion that Protestant services had been held in the house of the American minister.

After this debate, in which few if any Catholics took part, no successful attempt was made to re-establish the ministry. The American consulate, however, was retained in Rome.

THE GENERAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Society, held at Delmonico's on the evening of February 6, 1918, was one of the most enjoyable and satisfactory of the series. An audience that taxed the capacity of the assembly-room greeted his Eminence Cardinal Farley, who graced the occasion by his presence. In the absence of President Stephen Farrelly, because of illness, the vice-president, Mr. William R. King, presided, and, on behalf of the absent president, read a memorandum of the Society's activities during the year.

It was, he said, a very promising year and the various reports showed the Society to be in a very flourishing condition. The total membership was 359 and 27 new members had been received into the ranks since May, 1917. During the year the historical prize essay had been inaugurated for a contest among the students at our Catholic colleges, and it had had a most satisfactory result, the winner being a student at Georgetown University. A new volume had been distributed to the members of RECORDS AND STUDIES—Volume XI of the series—making nineteen volumes in all of most value historical data that had been published by the Society since its reorganization under the lamented Dr. Charles G. Herbermann. Much of this probably would have been lost had it not thus been collected by the contributors to our publications. These volumes will of course be continued.

The report of the treasurer, Mr. Henry F. Herbermann, indicated that the Society's finances were in a satisfactory condition.

The election of officers for the ensuing year then took place. In accordance with the rules of the Society, the Executive Coun-

cil submitted the following ticket to the members for their approval and it was unanimously elected:

Honorary President, his Eminence John Cardinal Farley; President, Stephen Farrelly; Vice-President, William R. King; Treasurer, Henry F. Herbermann; Corresponding Secretary, Joseph H. Fargis, LL.D.; Recording Secretary, Peter Condon; Librarian, Rev. Joseph F. Delany, D.D.

Trustees—Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph F. Mooney, V.G., Rt. Rev. Mgr. James H. McGean, D.D., Rt. Rev. Mgr. John F. Kearney, Rt. Rev. Mgr. Henry A. Brann, D.D., Thomas F. Meehan, Thomas S. O'Brien, LL.D., Condé B. Pallen, LL.D.

Councillors—Rev. Richard H. Tierney, S.J., Edward J. McGuire, LL.D., Thomas Hughes Kelly, William J. Amend, J. Vincent Crowne, Ph.D., Arthur F. J. Rémy.

Mr. King assured the audience next that they had a great pleasure in store for them in addresses that would be made by Mr. Michael Williams on "Catholic California," and by the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday of the Catholic University, on the value of a nationalization of Catholic historical societies. He introduced Mr. Williams as the first speaker.

The influence which Father Junipero Serra exerted on the civilization of California was the special theme of Mr. Williams' address, and he described Father Serra as the true founder of California.

"This little cross, made of oak wood, which I hold in my hand, comes from the tree under which a Carmelite friar said Mass when Vizcaino's expedition landed at Monterey Bay in 1602," said Mr. Williams. "Under the same tree the remains of which are still preserved at Monterey, Father Junipero Serra took possession of California in the name of the King of Spain in 1770. But it was even earlier than 1602 that the history of California began; it was in 1542, when Cabrillo sailed into what is now San Diego Bay. This was some fifty years before Raleigh reached Virginia; nearly a century before the Pilgrim Fathers

stepped upon Plymouth Rock, and long before the French settled Acadie or Quebec, or the Dutch penetrated into Pennsylvania. And from the beginning the history of California, which has been such a great factor in the history of the United States, has been a splendid romance, a high pageant of adventure and heroism in which even more than the sword, the cross has been the symbol.

“Idealism is the quality which most typically distinguishes the national character of our country and in furnishing those starry legends and stirring stories of the true quests of ideal interests which nourish the soul of a people, no State in the family of the States is more opulent and inspiring than Catholic California. For in California the best qualities of the Spanish conquest of America—from the beginning down through all the colored years of its western empire—predominated over its baser passions. The avarice and tyranny which too often marked the work of Spain in Mexico, South America and the West Indies, evils against which heroic priests like Las Casas, that true apostle of human liberty, labored so valiantly, were comparatively absent from California, the history of which, so far as Spain is concerned, is mainly a history not of the sword but of the cross, history of the wonderful works, great deeds and soul sweetening lives of the Spanish missionaries, of whom the great hero is, of course, Father Junipero Serra, the true founder of California, the first president of the famous missions.

“A true son of the people, Michael Joseph Serra is a great example of that truest of all democratic systems which is the Catholic Church: a system in which genius or goodness—the two greatest of human powers—always find their opportunities for service, whether they in whom they manifest are princes or paupers. And in giving Serra and his story to our young nation the ancient Church has given us one of the best examples of vital democracy, the basic idea of which is and ever must be, if it is to survive, willing and joyous service.

"Until Serra came to Mexico, in 1750 California had been left unsettled by Spain. But now the encroachments of England and Russia in the Pacific had aroused the King. The energetic Jose de Galvez, the financial expert sent by Spain to America to revive, if possible, the failing trade, was the statesman responsible for the expedition which settled California in 1769, but without Serra and his Franciscan friars, and the Mission system of civilizing and subduing the Indians, Spain's last effort to extend and hold her American empire would have been impossible. And it was Serra and his priests who did practically all that was finally accomplished in California, where the twenty-one Missions, extending from San Diego in the south to Sonoma in the north, with their beautiful and artistic churches, their tens of thousands of prosperous and contented Indian converts, constituted what is now recognized as one of the greatest achievements of humanity.

"It is true that the iniquity of the Mexican secularization ruined this marvelous achievement, and toppled the great work down in ruins. It is true that Serra disappeared from the scene of California, and even his body was lost in the ruins of his favorite church at Carmel. But death ends no life such as his. Nor can men destroy the best, the spiritual portion, of his labors. For today the Missions are one of the greatest assets of Californian civilization, of American civilization, and Serra, the humble priest, is a national hero. And it is a significant fact, one of which Catholics may well be proud, that Serra's present fame is due less, far less, to the appreciation of his fellow religionists, as such, than to the broad development of modern Californian civilization and patriotism, outside the lines of class and creed. Serra is the special admiration of those who admire the pioneers. Serra's greatness in American history transcends his high place in the annals of the Church, or, rather, it complements it. More and more does California see in Serra the true type of manhood, of civilized, democratic manhood. In his intellectual power

and attainments he was as eminent as he was for high sanctity; and his intellect was to him only one more instrument for performing the work of God. Perhaps the Church has given to America no truer example of its best men than Serra; and through Serra and his fellow friars California shows what great gifts Catholicism bestows upon our American civilization.

Following Mr. Williams the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday then outlined his idea of the plan and scope of an American Catholic Historical Association. After explaining the impetus given to historical studies by the United States Catholic Historical Society, the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia and others already established, the address set forth the urgency of collecting and collating the sources of our American Catholic history before and after Columbus' discovery, and even of our own days. The story of the Church's magnificent contribution to the civilization of the Americas and of the colonization of the hemisphere by the great Catholic settlers is still unwritten. At this point the lecturer paid a warm tribute to the excellent services rendered in Catholic history by Dr. John Gilmary Shea, and to the indefatigable labors of the late Dr. Charles G. Herbermann and Martin I. J. Griffin in the same cause. It was obvious that these and kindred workers in the field of Catholic Americana would have been encouraged and aided in a thousand practical ways by such an organization as the lecturer projected. Dr. Guilday outlined the functions of the new association, and made out an interesting case for the necessity of its immediate establishment. But he insisted that as to the merging of the United States Catholic Historical Society in the projected association nothing was further from his mind. Some sort of affiliation of the Society and of other Catholic historical societies with the association was planned, though he did not go definitely into the nature of the union, their individuality should remain intact. In point of fact, the new national association would rather tend to strengthen interest in Catholic history in our own circles and elsewhere. It

would open the way for many practical suggestions for the better carrying on and direction of the work in various centres by an exchange of ideas and by localizing effort where special work could best be prosecuted, and by centralizing effort and power in matters that are of larger and national embrace. For example, the lecturer made a point of the need of securing photographic copies of the various American papers and documents, scattered broadcast, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, in diocesan archives and in national libraries and museums. These valuable sources should be made available for the writers of our Catholic history. In order to do this research work a group of picked students should be trained, traveling bourses should be established for them and archivists should be maintained in the chief European centres. Other nations are doing similar work. The Philadelphia Catholic Historical Society had made a beginning of it. But of its nature the enterprise is one for a national organization. Local societies cannot be expected to cope with an undertaking of such a size and kind, which requires not only specialists to direct and conduct it, but also ampler funds than any of our existing societies can expect to gather.

By merging the several local Catholic historical societies in the proposed association, the larger questions of national scope would not be helped. But by becoming members individually of the new body, or by affiliating with it the societies already organized, so as to send delegates, let us say, to Catholic historical conventions and congresses, and by the resulting interchange of suggestions and guidance and encouragement, the general cause of Catholic history would be served, and at the same time the interests of the proposed association and of the local organizations would be advanced; and, what is more, it would enable the individual Catholic to perform his duty to help preserve the annals of our Catholic forebears, for the lessons which that sacred tradition can teach us, and for the defense of the good name of our Catholic past.

Apart from other considerations, an out-and-out merger of such a body as the United States Catholic Historical Society or the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia in the association that was proposed would run the risk of greater ultimate loss than gain. That is to say, one of the best means, if not the chief argument, for attaching members is the appeal to local patriotism. It touches one's pride. Men have a particular attraction to things that are near to them. They somehow are part of and belong to us and we feel we ought to belong to them. Take away or lessen this special local attraction, this loyalty to city and diocese, and there is great danger of sacrificing our membership without the compensating satisfaction of seeing it added to and remaining for any length of time as an interested part of a national association. It was thought, therefore, that the very best way to serve the new body is by preserving and increasing the usefulness of those now in existence, and by their co-operating meanwhile in every way possible for the solid establishment of the American Catholic Historical Association, which was projected.

A rising vote of thanks was then given to the speakers of the evening for their very interesting and instructive papers.

His Eminence Cardinal Farley was prevailed on to say a few words and expressed his very great pleasure at the proceedings of the evening and at the progress the Society was making. He poked some good-natured fun at Dr. Guilday's seemingly Utopian project, but reminded him that many great results have often followed from very small beginnings. He said that the need of a comprehensive history of the activities of the Church in this country was apparent. The Cardinal approved of the suggestion made by Dr. Guilday that a centralization of historical societies, which should carry on the work he had outlined, would be of much benefit, not only to the Church, but to all the people. He hoped the day would come when the whole people would realize the part the Church had taken in making this country

what it is today and what might be expected of it in the future.

Most of the company remained for the social reception that followed the formal meeting and spent a very enjoyable time discussing details of the evening's program.

NOTES AND COMMENT

The Executive Council of the Society has decided to repeat the offer of a prize of \$100 for the best historical paper in a contest between the students of our Catholic colleges. In connection with the first contest the President has received the following letter:

Georgetown University, January 26, 1918.

Mr. Stephen Farrelly,

President U. S. Catholic Historical Society:

Dear Sir—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the treasurer's check for \$100 as first prize in the historical essay contest recently conducted by the Society, as well as the receipt of two copies of Volume XI of RECORDS AND STUDIES in which the essay is included.

I wish to express my deep appreciation of the gracious consideration shown my essay by the Committee of Award, as also my appreciation of the kindness of the Society in forwarding me the two copies of RECORDS AND STUDIES. Permit me to assure you, Mr. President, that I shall ever be at the command of the Society and anything that I might do to forward its interests will be only too gladly welcomed by me.

Thanking you again for the many kindnesses and wishing the Society the most flourishing success, I am,

Very respectfully yours,

L. A. LANGIE.

The subject for the second contest will be announced in time for the scholastic year 1918-1919. A committee was also named, under the direction of the Rev. R. H. Tierney, S.J., to visit the various colleges and address the students on the subject of our

Catholic historical records and in an effort to interest them in their study.

One of the encouraging signs of the times is the constantly increasing interest in the preservation of the records of our Catholic American history. An instance is the following question recently sent to the Editor of *RECORDS AND STUDIES* by the compiler of a manual of historical data to be used in school work:

"What is the distinctively Catholic anniversary, date of month and year, in American history? Let me explain: I am gathering data on American anniversaries, to be published shortly. There should be a Catholic event having to do with the United States, or with the colonies, aside from the discovery, an event about which there can be no controversy, and which is accepted by all citizens, including Protestants and all non-Catholics. Can you tell me this? I would accept your judgment, for, of course, these things often are matters of individual taste."

"The event should be one that stands out, and from which great Catholic development followed. I have in mind such events as the consecration of the first Catholic Bishop in the United States, or the consecration of the first Catholic church in the American colonies. These dates would bear more concretely upon the Catholic Church organization than the early missionary dates, which, perhaps, would be regarded as fugitive events."

In answer to this query the following statement was sent:

"A survey of the records seems to indicate that March 25, 1634, is the date you desire. On that day Father Andrew White, S.J., celebrated the first Mass, on St. Clement's Island in the Potomac, and the Maryland Colony was founded. From this event and this date follow in unbroken sequence: public worship; religious toleration; the first native-born priests and the first native-born religious, men and women; the Hierarchy; Catholic education, the first schools and first college; the first

civic organization, St. Mary's City. No other event having to do with the United States shows such development, religious, social and political as this."

This will appear in the manual in question. On receipt of it the inquirer wrote: "The information is exactly what I want and indeed it opens up a newly-lighted field."

Initial steps were taken in March, in Chicago, to organize a Catholic Historical Society to make available the rich history of the Church in Illinois. The Rev. Frederic Siedenburg, S.J., presided at the preliminary meeting. He outlined the general plan of the society and spoke of the appropriateness of the present, the centennial year of the State, for its foundation. The society will publish a quarterly periodical to be known as the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, and such other books, pamphlets, monographs, etc., as it will find advisable. The editorial staff is headed by Joseph J. Thompson, with Rev. Frederick Beuckman, Belleville, Ill., Stetson Merrill, Rev. Francis J. Epstein, Kate Meade and Rev. Dr. J. Culemans, Moline, Ill.

It was the pleasant office of our own Society to aid in the organization of this new body by supplying its officers with copies of our rules, etc., and of such volumes of RECORDS AND STUDIES as are still in print. The officers elected by the Chicago society are: Honorary presidents, Archbishop Mundelein, Bishop P. J. Muldoon, Bishop Henry Althoff, Bishop Edmund F. Dunne, and Bishop Ryan; president, Hon. William J. Onahan; first vice-president, Rev. Frederic Siedenburg, S.J.; second vice-president, James M. Graham, Springfield, Ill.; correspondent secretary, James Fitzgerald; first recording secretary, Wm. J. Howly, Cairo, Ill.; second recording secretary, Margaret Madden; treasurer, Will J. Lawler; historiographer, Joseph J. Thompson. Incorporators are: Archbishop Mundelein, Rev. John B. Furay, S.J., Rev. Frederic Siedenburg, James M. Graham, Monsignor

D. J. Riordan, Michael F. Girten, Ed. O. Browne, Dr. John W. Melody, and Rev. J. J. Shannon, V.G., of Peoria.

At its meeting on May 15 the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis, Missouri, elected these officers to serve until May, 1919: President, Most Rev. John J. Glennon; first vice-president, Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. A. Connolly, V.G.; second vice-president, Edward P. Brown; third vice-president, Miss M. Louise Garesché; secretary, Rev. John Rothensteiner; assistant secretary, Miss Constance Smith; treasurer, Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. J. Tannrath, chancellor; archivists, Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., D.D., Rev. F. G. Holweck, and Rev. G. J. Garraghan, S.J.; Committee on Publication, Rev. F. G. Holweck, Rev. G. J. Garraghan, S.J., Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., D.D., and Edward Brown; Executive Committee, Rt. Rev. Mgr. P. W. Tallon, Rev. A. J. Happe, and Edward Brown.

It has been decided to publish a quarterly magazine, which will record the history of the Church in St. Louis and the surrounding territory. The Society has already on hand a great deal of material of historic value, much of which has never before been printed. The first issue of the publication will appear in September. A paper, "The Minutes of the Meetings of the Building Committee," that erected the Cathedral of St. Louis, 1830-32, was read at the meeting by Miss Louise Garesché.

A sculptured bronze roll of fame tablet has been erected in the Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis, by the Missouri Society of the United States Daughters of 1812 in commemoration of the pioneers of the State. There are fifteen Catholic names on the tablet. Heading the religious leaders are Right Rev. Louis W. Dubourg, S.S., D.D., one time Bishop of New Orleans and later Archbishop of Besançon, France; Father Felix De Andreis, C.M., missionary, educator, and Father Pierre J. de Smet, S.J., Indian missionary and diplomat. The other Catholic names are Venerable Philipine Rose Duchesne, founder of the first Sacred

Heart Convent in the United States; Marie Payant de Grauche, foremost Catholic woman teacher; Madame Elizabeth Ortes, philanthropist; Marguerite A. Pescay, who taught the first industrial school for Catholic girls; Madame Chauvin Beaulier *dit* Palmier, philanthropist; Captain Manuel Lisa, fur trader; Commandante Francois Valle, explorer and fur trader; Syndic Lewis Brazeau, fur trader; Dr. Antoine Saugrain, scientist; Charles Bosseron, manufacturer; John Mullanphy, philanthropist, and John R. Trudeau, educator.

The late Miss Florence MacKubin, an artist of Baltimore, bequeathed \$10,000 to the Maryland Historical Society for the erection of a monument to Charles Carroll, the Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence. The memorial is to be erected in Carroll Park, Baltimore.

The Right Rev. Mgr. F. A. O'Brien of Kalamazoo, Michigan, has been elected president of the Michigan Historical Commission in recognition of his long years of activity in the work of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society. Mgr. O'Brien was largely instrumental in bringing about by statute enactment, the creation of the Historical Commission, in 1913, and was appointed by the Governor as one of the members. In 1915 he was reappointed for a full term of six years.

Mgr. O'Brien has also had dedicated to him a notable work in two large volumes, "Historic Mackinac: The Historical, Picturesque, and Legendary Features of the Mackinac Country," by Edwin A. Wood, LL.D. It is illustrated from sketches, drawings, maps, and photographs, together with an original map of Mackinac Island, made especially for it. The author, who was formerly president of the Michigan Historical Commission, dedicates the work to Mgr. O'Brien as "a leader in everything tending to preserve material relating to the early history of the Great Lakes

country. A ripe scholar, he has given to the Michigan Historical Commission splendid executive ability and a large measure of energetic and practical service in its especial field of endeavor."

In the course of the proceedings for the promotion of the cause for the beatification of Mother Seton, who founded the American branch of the Sisters of Charity, a curious complication has arisen. No record has, as yet, been found of her baptism. The standard life of Mother Seton is that by the Rev. Dr. Charles I. White (1853). In the third edition (1879), to which the Emmitsburg authorities added an appendix, bringing the contents and history of the Sisters of Charity down to date, on page 152 we read:

"Under these conditions, Mrs. Seton applied without delay to be admitted into the 'one Fold under one Shepherd.' For this purpose, on March 14, Ash-Wednesday, she went to St. Peter's Church in a spirit of entire consecration of herself to God."

Then, quoting Mother Seton, herself, Dr. White goes on to record:

"If I could have thought of anything but God there was enough, I suppose, to have astonished a stranger by the hurrying over of the congregation; but as I came only to visit His Majesty, I knew not what it meant till afterward—that it was a day they received ashes, the beginning of Lent."

Continuing his history Dr. White says:

"After the service Mrs. Seton made a formal abjuration of Protestantism and profession of the Catholic faith at the hands of Rev. Matthew O'Brien, and in presence of Mr. Anthony Filicchi, her devoted friend."

To this is appended the following footnote (p. 153):

"In memory of this joyful occasion Mrs. Seton gave to Mr. Filicchi, who had been so instrumental in her conversion, a copy of the 'Following of Christ,' with this inscription: 'Antonio Filicchi, from his dear sister and friend Eliza A. Seton, to com-

memorate the happy day he presented her to the Church of God, the 14th March, 1805."

It will be observed that this says Mrs. Seton "made a formal abjuration of Protestantism and profession of the Catholic faith," but nothing about Baptism. The present rector of St. Peter's, the Rt. Rev. Mgr. McGean, has gone over the carefully preserved register of New York's first church, and has been unable to find any record of Mrs. Seton's Baptism, conditional or otherwise, on March 14, or on any other date. Of course, it is not to be thought for a moment that Father O'Brien did not comply with all the regulations required by the Church in this instance, but such is the record. Neither has Mgr. McGean been able so far to find a baptismal entry in the existing Trinity Church (Episcopalian) register, that for the earliest years of its history was lost in the fire of 1776.

Another curious incident: Dr. White quotes Mrs. Seton twice in recording this event as happening on *Ash Wednesday*, March 14, 1805. A reference to the calendar will show that March 14, 1805, fell on Thursday, not Wednesday. Whether Mrs. Seton made this slip in dates herself, or whether it was made in Dr. White's manuscript and was not caught before his book was printed in 1853, there is no way of finding out now. But there it is, and everybody who has written about Mrs. Seton's conversion since has been repeating the error.

In explanation of these discrepancies the Rev. Dr. C. L. Souvay, C.M., of Kenrick Seminary, offers the following suggestions:

"The root of one of these difficulties is that Ash Wednesday can never come later than March 10, and, as a matter of fact, in 1805, Ash Wednesday fell not on March 14, as Dr. White wrote, nor even on March 13, but on February 27, Easter being, that year, on April 14. My authority for this is the *"Ordo Perpetuus Divini Officii juxta Ritum Breviarii ac Missalis Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae,"* by a Benedictine of St. Maur, issued at

Dijon in 1759, and giving the ecclesiastical calendar for the years 1758-1900.

"Dr. White quotes Mrs. Seton twice in recording this event as happening on Ash Wednesday, March 14, 1805, but while Dr. White records the event as happening on Ash Wednesday, March 14, 1805, Mother Seton, in the quotations which he adduced never says so much explicitly. She tells indeed in a sentence how she went to St. Peter's Church on Ash Wednesday; again on page 156 (tenth edit., 1904), she informs Father Cheverus that, on March 14 her soul 'offered all its hesitations and reluctancies a sacrifice on the altar . . . and the next day was admitted to the true Church of Jesus Christ'; but it is remarkable that she does not say in the first place that Ash Wednesday was March 14; nor does she in the second place say that March 14 was Ash Wednesday; and, moreover, the inscription written by her on the copy of à Kempis presented by her to Anthony Filicchi whilst bearing the date, March 14, makes no reference to that day being Ash Wednesday. The identification of the two days seems to be therefore Dr. White's; and it is visibly an unfortunate slip, which all historians have since repeated slavishly.

"The date of Ash Wednesday, 1805, being kept before the mind, and the statements of Mother Seton, as given by Dr. White being given their full value, here is how I would be inclined to sum up briefly the events of that momentous period of her life:

"Shortly after January 6, 1805, she unsuccessfully sought an interview with Father O'Brien (White p. 148); Jan.-Feb.: letter to Father Cheverus, and reply of the latter (White, p. 149); letter of Bishop Carroll to Filicchi (White, pp. 149-151; Feb. 27 (Ash Wednesday); goes to St. Peter's (White, p. 152); March 14-15: abjuration and profession of faith (White, p. 153, note); a few days before March 25: Confession. Speaking of Confession, she says: 'It is done—easy enough' (White, p. 153),

and of Communion: 'I count the days and hours' (p. 154). March 25: First Communion.

"It seems to me to stand to reason that Father O'Brien could not receive her abjuration and profession of faith on the very day she definitely and irrevocably made up her mind to become a Catholic (Ash Wednesday, February 27). A few days must quite naturally intervene; and, as I read Dr. White (leaving aside, of course, his mistaken chronological identification), I find just two weeks, a reasonable period. The above inferences, based on the correct dating of that Ash Wednesday, and Mother Seton's unimpeachable statement she was 'presented to the Church the 14th of March,' seem to impose themselves. Well deduced as they appear to be, I should like, however, to see them confirmed by some text of Mother Seton or of her correspondents, and do not despair to find sooner or later such texts in existence.

"Was she baptized in the Catholic Church? The careful examination of St. Peter's baptismal register was not, in my view of the event, a fruitless task. For the silence of that register finds its natural and adequate explanation, I think, in the regulations of the first Synod of Baltimore (1791). Mrs. Seton was apparently not baptized in the Catholic Church, nor were even the ceremonies of Baptism supplied. Such was the practice with regard to converts whose Baptism in a heretical sect was considered valid. That the Protestant Episcopal Baptism was then regarded valid by Church authorities, I find two warrants in Dr. White's work. The first is in Bishop Carroll's letter, quoted on pages 149-150: 'Her great business now should be . . . to revive in her heart the grace of her Baptism' (page 150). No one who did not believe in the validity of Mrs. Seton's Episcopal Baptism could write this sentence. The second warrant, perhaps still stronger, is in Father Cheverus' letter of January 26, 1806, about Cecilia Seton's sickness: 'Your beloved sister has been made by Baptism a member of the Church' (p.

185); and so strong was his persuasion of the validity of Miss Seton's Baptism that he opened the suggestion of her receiving 'the Sacraments,' meaning, as his words on pages 184-185 unmistakably indicate, Holy Communion and Extreme Unction. No Baptism, nor even the supplying of the ceremonies, having taken place, there was no call for any entry in the register. It is somewhat disappointing to learn that no baptismal entry has been found in the Trinity Church (Protestant Episcopal) register. But is it certain that Eliza A. Bayley was baptized at Trinity Church? Why not at St. Paul's or St. George's? For is it known in what (Episcopal) parish the Bayleys lived in August, 1774? Is it certain even that she was baptized in New York?

"Further research, however, will be needed, both in Mother Seton's letters and in the church registers: *v. g.*, ascertaining the silence of these registers on the Catholic Baptism of Cecilia Seton, of Harriet Seton later on at Emmitsburg, and of Mrs. Seton's own children; also hunting up the entry of the Baptism of them all in the Protestant Episcopal Church."

No doubt further investigation along the lines suggested by Dr. Souvay will bring to light the required data concerning this important chapter of Mother Seton's career. Her maternal grandfather was the Rev. Dr. Richard Charlton, rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, on Staten Island, which was built in 1713, and to which Queen Anne presented a silver communion service and several articles of altar furnishings. In Clute's "Annals of Staten Island" (New York, 1877, p. 264) we read:

"In 1747 the Rev. Richard Charlton became rector; his eldest daughter was connected by marriage to the Dongan family, and another daughter was the wife of Dr. Richard Bailey, who was Health Officer of the Port of New York, and died in 1801; his remains are interred in the graveyard of the church. Dr. Charlton's ministry continued thirty-two years; he died in 1779 and was buried under the church."

The suggestion had been made that Mrs. Seton's mother died

at Newtown, Long Island, and was buried there, and that perhaps the baptismal record might be found in the register of the old Episcopal church there. The records of this church are extant, but they do not corroborate either of these statements.

For much that we have on record of the organization of Catholic New York's first parish, we are indebted to the industry of Thomas O'Connor, who came here from Ireland in 1801, and died in New York in 1855 at the age of eighty-five. He was the grandson of Charles O'Conor of Belanagare, the famous Irish antiquarian, who brought him up. Thomas O'Connor edited several papers in New York, among them the *Shamrock* (1810-1817), Ireland and Catholicism being its leading topics. His son was the great jurist, Charles O'Conor, the foremost lawyer of his time. The latter spelled his name with one n, while his father used two. This difference of spelling has often piqued curiosity, and, in answer to a query on the subject, Charles O'Conor's nephew, Mr. Charles W. Sloane, an ever-zealous member of our Society, was kind enough to make this reply:

"Concerning the spelling of O'Conor or O'Connor, my uncle had been taught in early youth to spell the name with two n's. So, until middle-age, the name was spelled by his great-grandfather, Charles O'Conor of Belanagare. This ancestor of mine was deemed in his time learned in old Irish history. As the result apparently of investigation he changed the spelling. This change not being made until he had reached middle-age, his son, my grandfather, declined to follow his father's example. But when my uncle visited Ireland in 1841 he became convinced of the propriety of adopting his great-grandfather's course.

"To quote his own words from his journal of this 1841 trip: 'There was a time when our ancestors, like those of the rest of the Irish O'Conors, I suppose, did not know how to write or spell. In those days of darkness the practice grew up, it is not known how, of spelling the name with the double n. Charles

O'Conor of Belanagare, the historian, was the first literary man of the family. He originally spelled it like all others with the double n. Subsequently he ascertained from documents to be found in Rhymer's 'Foedera,' and otherwise, that Roderic O'Conor, the king, and also Phelin, the hero of Athenree, either wrote the name, or had it written with only one n, in the middle of it, and thereupon he struck out the repetition. His eldest son Denis, who of course succeeded to the family estates, imitated him. His son Charles, my grandfather, adhered to the method of spelling the name which he had learned in his youth; and hence the difference."

"'The single consonant,' my uncle wrote many years later, 'affords a better approximation, or similitude, to the original and this justifies its use. I presume there is nothing distinctive in it. Any and every person among the thousands bearing the name may rightfully adopt that method of spelling it. There is no doubt that Charles O'Conor of Belanagare first adopted it about as late as his fortieth year. If it was an inaccurate method of spelling his adoption of it might have given him and his descendants some shadow of claim to its use as a peculiar designation. But being the rectification of an erroneous mode and the privilege of improvement by conforming to or more nearly approaching the truth being common to all, every O'Conor in the world was at liberty to conform.'"

"There was a bitter," adds Mr. Sloane, "yet rather absurdly conducted controversy involving this matter of spelling started in or about 1859 by a member of that branch of the O'Conor family which had conformed to the Protestant religion. The controversy, to which I allude was taken up by one of the Catholic O'Conors, who seems to have been a person of considerable irascibility. And the contest continued so long that some one (himself related to one of the contestants, I believe) blessed with more sense of humor doubtless than either party to the wordy fray, styled it the 'n-less controversy'."

Charles O'Conor kept a diary, Mr. Sloane says, in an intermittent fashion from August 30, 1842, until September 10, 1843, from which he makes these extracts:

"Sept. 27, 1842. I attended this evening by invitation a select meeting at the house of Mr. James Shea for the purpose of concerting measures to erect by subscription a monument to the memory of Dr. Wm. James Macneven. I presided, T. W. Clerke acted as Secretary, committees were appointed and the matter put in a train to be fairly tried. I think the required amount can be raised. Last evening I read a very pretty biographical sketch of this very distinguished gentleman prepared for the use of Dr. Madden by his amiable and talented daughter, Jane.

"Oct. 5, 1842, night. Last evening a public meeting was held on the subject of the Macneven monument. Considering the hardness of the times and the universal phlegm that seems at this moment to pervade society, it was a spirited gathering. It provides well for the success of the design. Being selected as chairman I delivered impromptu a brief, undigested and rather clumsy address. John McKeon, Robert Emmet, Dr. Robert Hogan and Thomas W. Clerke spoke each at some length and with great animation. An executive and collective committees (sic) were appointed and the requisite measures adopted for a regularly organized and systematic course of operations. I am permanent chairman and shall be obliged to devote some time and trouble to carrying on the enterprise. It is the first public matter apart from judicial proceedings in which I have participated since the great conservative meeting in Jan'y 1838. A five (sic) years quarantine has made me rusty in such matters.

"Dr. Macneven, independently of his high claims to the consideration and respect of all men entertaining liberal opinions and Irish feelings, has on private grounds a right to the employment of my best exertions in securing the tribute due to the memory of his eminent public and private virtues.

"Nov. 13, 1842, Sunday. . . . The Macneven monument

affair progresses slowly and tamely. In the wards where Irishmen abound nothing has been done. Still I think the object will be accomplished.

"January 14, 1843. . . . The Macneven monument affair progresses slowly and with difficulty and at this moment seems to have fallen into absolute torpor."

And the diary alludes no further to the subject. We know, however, that the project was brought to a successful conclusion and the memorial is one of Broadway's landmarks on the Vesey street corner of St. Paul's churchyard. Dr. Macneven's wife was a Riker. He died July 12, 1841, and was buried in the family graveyard in the rear of the Riker mansion on the shore of Bowery Bay, Long Island.

UNITED STATES HISTORICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS

Honorary President,
HIS EMINENCE JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY.

President,
STEPHEN FARRELLY.

Vice-President,
WILLIAM R. KING.

Treasurer,
HENRY F. HERBERMANN.

Corresponding Secretary,
JOSEPH H. FARGIS, LL.D.

Recording Secretary,
PETER CONDON, A.M.

Librarian,
REV. JOSEPH F. DELANY, D.D.

Trustees,

Rt. REV. MGR. JOSEPH F. MOONEY, V.G.

Rt. REV. MGR. JAMES H. McGEEAN, D.D.

Rt. REV. MGR. JOHN F. KEARNEY.

Rt. REV. MGR. HENRY A. BRANN, D.D.

THOMAS S. O'BRIEN, LL.D. THOMAS HUGHES KELLY.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN, A.M.

Councillors,

REV. R. H. TIERNEY, S.J. WILLIAM J. AMEND.

EDWARD J. MCGUIRE, LL.D. J. VINCENT CROWNE, PH.D.

CONDÉ B. PALLEN. ARTHUR F. J. RÉMY,

MEMBERS.

ADAMS, ROBERT A.
 ADAMS, SAMUEL.
 ADAMS, T. ALBEUS.
 ADIKES, JOHN.
 AGAR, JOHN G.
 ALMIRALL, RAYMOND F.
 AMBERG, WILLIAM A.
 AMEND, WILLIAM J.
 AMY, ALFRED V.
 AMY, L. H.
 ASPEL, DR. JOHN.
 BARRETT, NICHOLAS J.
 BARTLEY, REV. JAMES R.
 BENZIGER, BRUNO.
 BENZIGER, LOUIS G.
 BENZIGER, NICHOLAS C.
 BISTER, JOHN.
 BOGAN, REV. B. M.
 BORNEMANN, RT. REV. MGR.
 GEORGE.
 BRADY, REV. JOHN F.
 BRANN, RT. REV. MGR.
 HENRY A., D.D.
 BRESLIN, REV. P. N.
 BRIODY, REV. JOHN H.
 BRISTED, C. A.
 BRITT, MR. PHILIP J.
 BRODERICK, DANIEL I.
 BROPHY, W. H.
 BRUNE, VERY REV. F. J.
 BURKE, PROF. EDMOND.
 BURKE, MRS. ELLEN B.
 BURKE, REV. JOHN J., C.S.P.
 BUTLER, JAMES.
 BYRNE, JAMES.
 CAMPBELL, REV. JOS. C.
 CAMPBELL, REV. THOS. J., S.J.
 CAMPBELL, FRANCIS P.
 CAPUCHIN FATHERS.
 CASEY, A. J.
 CHIDWICK, RIGHT REV. MGR.,
 J.P.
 CHUTE, MRS. S. H.
 CLARE, MISS MARY E.
 CLARE, WILLIAM F.
 CLARK, REV. ARTHUR MARCH.
 CLARKE, WILLIAM B.
 CLAUDE, REV. CAPISTRAN,
 O. M. Cap.
 CLEARY, JOHN J.
 CLEMENS, MRS. JAMES R.
 COCKRAN, WILLIAM BOURKE.
 COLLIER, ROBT. J.
 COLLINS, VERY REV. MGR.
 CHAS. W.
 CONDON, MARTIN.
 CONDON, PETER
 CONLEY, LOUIS D.
 CONNOLLY, REV. ARTHUR T.
 CONNOLLY, VERY REV. MGR.
 JAMES N.
 CONROY, CHAS. C.
 COOKE, A. S.
 CORRIGAN, RT. REV. OWEN B.,
 D.D.
 COURTNEY, REV. W. A.

COYLE, JOHN J., M.D.
CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY.
CRONIN, MISS JULIA L.
CRONIN, REV. DANIEL T.
CROWNE, J. VINCENT.
CUDDIHY, R. J.
CUNNION, FRANK P.
CURRY, EDMUND J.
CUSACK, RT. REV. THOS. F.,
D.D.
DEERY, JOHN J.
DEITSCH, MISS M.
DELANY, REV. JOSEPH F. D.D.
DELEHANTY, HON. F. B.
DE ROO, REV. P.
DEVINE, THOMAS J.
DEVVOY, JOHN W.
DINEEN, REV. JOS. P.
DONAHUE LIBRARY, SAN FRAN-
CISCO, CAL.
DONLON, REV. ALPHONSUS J.,
S. J.
DONNELLY, RT. REV. MGR. E. J.,
V.F.
DONOGHUE, HON. F. X.
DONOHUE, RT. REV. P. J., D.D.
DONOHUE, DANIEL.
DOODY, REV. DANIEL.
DOOLEY, M. F.
DOOLEY, REV. JOHN H.
DOONER, EDW. J.
DOUGHERTY, WILLIAM F.
DOWLING, RT. REV. AUSTIN,
D.D.
DOWLING, HON. VICTOR J.
DOYLE, ALFRED L.
DOYLE, JOHN F., JR.
DUFFY, REV. FRANCIS P.
DUFFY, JAMES K.
DUFFY, JAMES P. B.
DUFFY, REV. THOS F.
DUTTON, JOSEPH.
EARLEY, REV. TERENCE J.
EDWARDS, RT. REV. MGR.
JOHN, V.G.
EMMET, DR. THOS. ADDIS.
EWING, CHARLES.
FALAHEE, JOHN J.
FARGIS, JOSEPH H.
FARLEY, HIS EMINENCE
JOHN M. CARDINAL.
FARRELL, EDW. D.
FARRELL, REV. HERBERT F.
FARRELLY, STEPHEN.
FAUSS, DENNIS C.
FEEHAN, RT. REV. D. F., D.D.
FEITNER, THOMAS L.
FERRER, JOSÉ M., M.D.
FINLAY, SIDNEY J.
FITZMAURICE, RT. REV.
JOHN E., D. D.
FITZPATRICK, REV. MALICK J.
FLANNELLY, REV. JOSE F.
FLOOD, RT. REV. MGR. JAS. J.
FLOYD-JONES, G. STANTON.
FORSYTH, WILLIAM J.
FOX, PROF. WILLIAM.
FRANKLIN, JOSEPH.

FREY, JOSEPH.
FULLER, FREDERICK J.
GANNON, FRANK S.
GASSLER, REV. LEON.
GAVIGAN, HON. EDWARD.
GEOGHEGAN, JOSEPH.
GIBBON, JOHN T.
GIBBONS, HIS EMINENCE
JAMES CARDINAL.
GIBLIN, JOHN A.
GILLESPIE, GEORGE J.
GLEASON, REV. JOSEPH M.
GOODWIN, FRANK J.
GRACE, JOSEPH P.
GRADY, WALTER L.
GUERTIN, RT. REV. G. A.,
D.D.
GUINEVAN, REV. PETER F.
GUMMERSBACH, JOSEPH.
HAGGERTY, J. HENRY.
HALLORAN, JOHN H.
HAMILTON, WILLIAM PETER.
HANEY, MICHAEL J.
HANNIGAN, STEPHEN.
HARRINGTON, REV. WM. H.
HARRIS, CHAS. N.
HARTFORD, GEORGE H.
HAYES, CARROLL.
HAYES, RT. REV. P. J., D.D.
HAYWARD, DR. V. S.
HEIDE, HENRY.
HEIDE, HENRY, JR.
HEIDE, WILLIAM F.
HERBERMANN, ELIZABETH P.
HERBERMANN, HENRY.
HERBERMANN, HENRY F.
HICKEY, VERY REV. MGR.
DAVID J.
HICKEY, REV. W. D.
HIGGINS, REV. JAMES J.
Ph.D.
HIMMEL, REV. JOS., S.J.
HOLTZMAN, L. F.
HOLWECK, REV. F. G.
HOLY CROSS COLLEGE,
PRESIDENT OF.
HOPKINS, JOHN A.
HOWARD, REV. JAS. J.
HOWLETT, REV. WM. J.
HUNTMAN, REV. GERARD.
HUSSEY, J. B.
HURLEY, RT. REV. MGR.
EDW. F.
HYNES, REV. ROBERT.
JOYCE, MICHAEL J.
KEANE, JAMES R.
KEANY, JOSEPH F.
KEARNEY, RT. REV. MGR.
JOHN F.
KEARNS, B. T.
KELLEY, REV. THOS. B.
KELLY, DR. CHAS. J.
KELLY, MRS. HUGH.
KELLY, REV. JOS. S.
KELLY, THOMAS H.
KENEDY, ARTHUR.
KENNEDY, THOMAS F.
KENNY, DAVID T.

KENNY, EDWARD J.
 KENT, JOHN S. M.
 KEYES, EDWARD L.
 KIELTY, M. T.
 KIERAN, PROF. JAMES M.
 KIERNAN, PATRICK.
 KING, PERCY J.
 KING, WILLIAM R.
 LAVELLE, RT. REV. MGR.
 M. J., D.D.
 LAWLER, JOSEPH A.
 LEAHY, WM. J.
 LEARY, THOMAS J.
 LENANE, THOMAS.
 LEWIS, JAMES M.
 LIBRARY OF ST. MARY'S SEMINARY, BALTIMORE, Md.
 LINEHAN, PAUL H.
 LOUBAT, JOSEPH F.
 LOYOLA SCHOOL, NEW YORK CITY.
 LYDON, RICHARD P.
 LYNCH, DR. J. B.
 LYNCH, RT. REV. MGR. J. S.
 M., D.D.
 LYONS, JERE C.
 MADDEN, RT. REV. MGR.
 JOHN T.
 MAGINNIS, MICHAEL.
 MAGOVERN, MARY A.
 MALONE, HON. DUDLEY FIELD.
 MANHATTAN COLLEGE.
 MARIQUE, PROF. PIERRE.
 MARTIN, JAMES J.

MAYO, HON. JOHN B.
 MEANY, EDW., M.D.
 MEEHAN, THOMAS F.
 MELVIN, THOMAS P.
 MESSMER, MOST REV. S. G.,
 D.D.
 MEYER, REV. HENRY J.
 MINRATH, F. R.
 MITCHELL, JOHN J.
 MOLLOY, JOSEPH A.
 MOONEY, RT. REV. MGR.
 JOSEPH F.
 MORRELL, MRS. EDWARD.
 MORRIS, RT. REV. JOHN B.,
 D.D.
 MOTHER DOLORES, ST. VINCENT'S RETREAT, HARRISON, N. Y.
 MOTHER SUPERIOR, ACADEMY MT. ST. VINCENT, N. Y.
 MOTHER SUPERIOR, CONVENT ST. JOSEPH, BRENTWOOD, L. I.
 MOTHER SUPERIOR, SISTERS OF CHARITY, MT. ST. VINCENT, N. Y.
 MULLEN, REV. J. J.
 MULLEN, REV. JOHN T.
 MULQUEEN, HON. JOS. F.
 MULQUEEN, MICHAEL J.
 MURPHY, EDWARD.
 MURPHY, JOHN H.
 MURPHY, MISS NORA.
 MURPHY, VERY REV. MGR.
 WM. G.

MURRAY, CHARLES.
MURRAY, REV. MICHAEL J.
MURRIN, JAS. B.
MCANERNEY, JOHN.
MCBRIDE, T. J.
MCCAFFREY, JOHN B., M.D.
MC CALL, HON. EDW. E.
MCCARTEN, MRS. ELIZABETH C.
McCORMICK, REV. JOHN G.
McDONNELL, RT. REV. CHAS.
E., D.D.
MC ELDERRY, VINCENT J.
MC ELROY, MRS. WM. B.
MC GARE, REV. THOMAS F.
MC GEAN, RT. REV. MGR. JAS. H.
MC GOLRICK, VERY REV. MGR.
EDW. J.
MC GRANE, HUGH D.
MC GRATH, REV. J. B.
MC GUIRE, EDW. J.
MC GUIRE, JOSEPH HUBERT.
MC HUGH, REV. JOHN B.
MC KENNA, RT. REV. MGR.
EDWARD.
MC KENNA, THOMAS P.
MC LOUGHLIN, MISS MARY J.
MC MAHON, REV. DR. JOS. H.
MC NABOE, JAS. F.
MC PARLAN, EDW. C.
MC PARLAND, JOHN E.
NAGELEISEN, REV. J. A., P.R.
NEAGLE, REV. RICHARD.
NEESER, JOHN G.
Neill, CHAS. P.
NOLAN, REV. JOHN A.
NOONAN, REV. JAS. E.
NOONAN, JOHN.
O'BRIEN, VERY REV. F. A.
LL.D.
O'BRIEN, DR. JOHN J.
O'BRIEN, MORGAN J.
O'BRIEN, REV. JOHN.
O'BRIEN, THOS. S., LL.D.
O'CONNELL, RT. REV. D. J.,
D.D.
O'CONNOR, J. P.
O'CONNOR, RT. REV. JOHN J.,
D.D.
O'DONOHUE, TERESA R.
O'DONOHUE, LOUIS V.
O'GORMAN, HON. JAMES A.
O'GORMAN, RICHARD J.
OHLIGSCHLOGER, J. B.
O'KEEFE, JOHN G.
O'KEEFE, REV. JOHN J.
O'KEEFE, REV. T. M.
OLCOTT, MRS. CHAS.
O'LEARY, DENNIS.
OLENDORF, C. D.
O'MARRA, REV. PATRICK A.
O'NEILL, REV. JOHN J.
ORR, WILLIAM C.
OWENS, JOS. E.
PALLEN, CONDÉ B., LL.D.
PAYNE, REV. RAYMOND, D.D.
PHELAN, REV. THOS. P.
PHILBIN, EUGENE A.
PLUNKET, JAMES.

PRENDERGAST, JAMES M.
PRENDERGAST, WILLIAM A.
PULLEYN, JOHN J.
QUINLAN, FRANCIS J., M.D.
QUINN, REV. DANIEL A.
RAINER, RT. REV. MGR. JOSEPH
REDEMPTORIST FATHERS,
 BROOKLYN, N. Y.
REDWOOD, MOST REV. FRANCIS,
 D.D.
REID, REV. CHAS. F.
REILLY, REV. M. A.
RÉMY, PROF. A. F. J.
RIDDER, HENRY.
ROBINSON, GEO. B.
RODGERS, J. C.
ROE, J. A.
ROONEY, J. A.
RUDGE, GEORGE, JR.
RYAN, MRS. JOSEPH T.
RYAN, THOMAS F.
RUPPERT, MRS. JACOB.
RYAN, JOHN D.
SCHAEFER, JOSEPH.
SCHNEIDER, REV. FREDERICK M.
SCHOPP, ADAM A.
SCHREMBS, RT. REV. JOSEPH,
 D.D.
SCOTT, JOSEPH.
SCULLY, REV. PATRICK F.
SCULLY, P. J.
SHAHAN, RT. REV. THOS. J.,
 D.D.
SHEAHAN, REV. J. F.

SHEEDY, BRYAN D., M.D.
SHEEHAN, JOHN C.
SHEPPARD, RT. REV. MGR.
 JOHN A.
SHRIVER, C. C.
SILO, JAMES P.
SLOANE, CHAS. W.
SLOANE, DR. THOS. O'CONOR.
SMITH, BRYAN.
SMITH, JAMES.
SMITH, JOHN T.
SMITH, REV. JAMES J.
SMITH, REV. JOSEPH F.
SPILLANE, REV. EDW. P., S.J.
ST. BENEDECT'S ABBEY,
 ATCHISON, KAN.
STEWART, REV. W. J.
SULLIVAN, J. A.
SWEENEY, RIGHT REV. MGR.
 EDWIN M.
TAAFFE, VERY REV. MGR.
 THOMAS.
TALLEY, ALFRED J.
THEBAUD, PAUL G.
TIERNEY, REV. EDW. J.
TIERNEY, MYLES.
TIERNEY, REV. RICHARD H.,
 S.J.
TREACY, REV. JAS. P., D.D.
TREACY, RICHARD S.
VAN ANTWERP, REV. FRANCIS J.
VELASCO, DIONISIO.
WADLIN, H. G.

WALL, RT. REV. MGR.	WIENKER, VERY REV. H.
FRANCIS H., D.D.	CLEMENT.
WALSH, RT. REV. LOUIS S.,	WOODLOCK, THOS. F., LL.D.
D.D.	WOODS, REV. JOS., S.J.
WALTERS, CHAS. F.	WRIGHT, F. E.
WEBBER, CHAS. A.	WUCHER, VERY REV.
WEIR, REV. JOHN F.	THEOPHILE, S.P.M.
WHALEN, GROVER M.	WYNNE, REV. JOHN J., S.J.
WICKHAM, REV. JOHN E.	YAWMAN, P. H.
WICKHAM, JOSEPH F.	ZAPLOTNIK, REV. J. L.



E United States Catholic
184 Historical Society
C3U5 Historical records and
v.12 studies

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
